

The Construction of Power.

An Investigation into the Nature and Representation of Authority in
Etruria During the Orientalising and Archaic Periods
(seventh and sixth centuries BC).

Volume I

C. Roth-Murray

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D
Institute of Archaeology
University College London
2005

UMI Number: U602739

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U602739

Published by ProQuest LLC 2014. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

This thesis offers a new approach to examining social change for the Etruscans. As its working hypothesis, this project presents a new model for investigating the development of authoritative statuses for the Etruscans during the Orientalising and Archaic periods (seventh and sixth centuries BC).

In the past, much work on the Etruscans has been affected by the reliance upon Greece and Rome as reference points for viewing the Etruscans, and the common binary division of viewing the Etruscans either through funerary or ritual contexts. As an alternative approach, this thesis suggests that Etruscan settlements should be investigated as independent entities, which are the products of gradual, indigenous developments. Rather than investigating *the* Etruscan culture and Etruria as being homogenous, the settlements must be viewed as related, but separate entities, in order to account for the unique developments present at each. The use of a multicontextual approach, combining information from funerary, domestic and ritual contexts, allowed for the widest possible understanding of how change in one area of social life can affect changes elsewhere. Investigating the use of iconography in all of these spheres at each settlement demonstrates specific messages being communicated within and between communities. The formation of the settlements, as seen through their spatial organisation, monumental architecture for funerary, domestic and ritual purposes and iconography, relates directly to the creation of special statuses which allowed individuals to hold control over these structures and the activities associated with them. This project also utilises an anthropological perspective in an attempt to reconcile the difficulties of investigating social change, by recognising choice at both the group and individual levels.

The viability of this approach is demonstrated through a study of ten sites from the Orientalising and Archaic periods which contained monumental architecture of a ritual nature. Second, these are divided into groups based on their duration during this period, of being destroyed in or continuing after the sixth century BC. The emerging patterns suggest that this period marks major transformations in social life, and social hierarchy among the Etruscans. In particular, the construction, deconstruction and transformation of ritual architecture demonstrate dramatic changes in the authority related to the ritual sphere. More specifically, several sites show evidence that authority in the ritual sphere was combined with other types of authority, reflected architecturally in ritual complexes, which resulted in the destruction or restructuring of these types of structures, and led to the development of temples, characterised by ritual authority of a different nature, and the development of votive deposits as a new ritual practice. The end of this period illustrates growing centralisation of authority through a decrease in competition with fewer ritual structures per site, restraint in the funerary sphere and major construction projects, making the site a cohesive whole brought together with streets, walls and *cuniculi*. Rather than a linear progression of types of authority spreading across the region, this study has shown the complex variations involved.

In addition to contributing an in-depth examination of Etruscan society, and its unique developments at several sites, the approach in this thesis offers a more widely applicable method of examining action and choice at both group and individual levels. This thesis provides a strong argument for more intra-site investigations to recognise the degree of variability across a region.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

ii	ABSTRACT
iii	TABLE OF CONTENTS
1	PREFACE
2	LIST OF TABLES
3	LIST OF FIGURES
8	LIST OF CHARTS
9	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PART ONE

11	I. INTRODUCTION
13	A. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE ETRUSCANS
13	1. TRADITIONAL APPROACHES
15	2. LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY
22	3. BEYOND LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY
25	B. THE DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROJECT
28	C. LIMITATIONS
31	D. METHODOLOGY
35	II. THEORETICAL ISSUES
35	A. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
35	1. AUTHORITY
40	2. RITUAL
41	3. IDEOLOGY
45	4. ICONOGRAPHY
50	5. ELITES AND POWER THROUGH MONUMENTAL ARCHITECTURE
52	6. SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL THROUGH BURIAL EVIDENCE
58	B. SOCIAL EVOLUTION AND AGENCY THEORY
58	1. INTRODUCTION
59	2. BACKGROUND TO SOCIAL EVOLUTIONARY MODELS
62	3. CRITIQUE OF SOCIAL EVOLUTIONARY MODELS
65	4. DEVELOPMENT OF AGENCY THEORY
67	5. PROPOSAL
69	III. LITERATURE REVIEW
69	A. VIEWS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL POWER FOR THE ETRUSCANS
69	1. CLASSICAL SOURCES
72	2. CULTURAL STIMULI AND THE RISE OF THE ARISTOCRATS
78	3. PRIESTHOODS AND RITUAL POWER

85	B. VIEWS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF RITUAL STRUCTURES AND POWER FOR THE ETRUSCANS
85	1. CLASSICAL SOURCES
86	2. LANDSCAPE APPROACHES TO RITUAL
92	3. FORM AND DECORATION OF RITUAL STRUCTURES
94	3.1 A CLOSER LOOK AT ARCHITECTURAL DECORATIONS
98	4. THE 'SEATED ASSEMBLY' FRIEZE PLAQUES
99	4.1 THE FRIEZE PLAQUES AS DEPICTIONS OF DEITIES
102	4.2 THE FRIEZE PLAQUES AS DEPICTIONS OF MORTALS
105	4.3 FRIEZE PLAQUE CONCLUSIONS
106	C. APPROACHES TO ETRUSCAN POWER BASED ON LINGUISTIC MATERIAL
117	D. CONCLUSIONS

PART TWO

119	IV. THE SITES
120	A. SITES WHICH DID NOT SURVIVE PAST THE SIXTH CENTURY BC
121	ACQUAROSSA
128	CASTELNUOVO BERARDEGNA
130	MURLO
134	B. SITES WHICH SURVIVED PAST THE SIXTH CENTURY BC
135	CAERE
149	TARQUINIA
161	VEII
179	C. SITES WITH LITTLE INFORMATION AVAILABLE
180	1. MAIN POSSIBILITIES
180	CASTELLINA DEL MARANGONE
182	PUNTA DELLA VIPERA
184	POGGIO BUCO
185	TUSCANIA
188	2. OTHER POSSIBLE SITES IN ETRURIA:
188	ORVIETO
189	a) REMAINS OF ARCHITECTURAL TERRACOTTAS:
189	CHIUSI
189	VULCI
189	b) SPRING SANCTUARIES:
190	AREZZO
190	MARZABOTTO
191	3. LATIUM VETUS:

191	ROME
192	VELLETRI
194	V. ICONOGRAPHY RELATED TO THE RITUAL STRUCTURES
194	A. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RITUAL STRUCTURES
196	B. THE FORM OF THE RITUAL STRUCTURES
196	1. CONSTRUCTION
198	2. DESTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION
200	3. VOTIVE DEPOSITS
205	C. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FRIEZE PLAQUES
207	1. DISTRIBUTION OF THE FRIEZE PLAQUES
210	2. THE THEMES
212	3. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NETWORKS
217	VI. ICONOGRAPHY RELATED TO POWER FROM OTHER CONTEXTS
217	A. EXTRACTING MEANING FROM FUNERARY AND SETTLEMENT CONTEXTS
218	B. SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF ICONOGRAPHY IN MULTIPLE CONTEXTS
218	1. THE <i>LITUUS</i>
226	2. CEREMONIAL AXES AND KNIVES
233	3. THE CHARIOT
234	4. OTHER OBJECTS WITH DIVINE ASSOCIATIONS
234	a) FRUIT AND FLOWER-LIKE OBJECTS
235	b) THE SCEPTRE
237	C. A CLOSER LOOK AT THE INTEGRATION OF THE SYMBOLS
240	D. CONCLUSIONS

PART THREE

242	VII. INTERPRETATIONS
242	A. CRITIQUE OF HOW ETRUSCAN SOCIETY IS OFTEN VIEWED
249	B. ALTERNATIVE INTERPRETATIONS
252	1. THE USE OF ICONOGRAPHY AND THE DEPICTION OF AUTHORITY AT EACH SITE
257	2. THE CO-DEVELOPMENT OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND THE RITUAL STRUCTURES
259	3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOTIVE DEPOSITS
260	4. AFTERMATH OF THE LATE SIXTH CENTURY BC

263 C. DISCUSSING TERMS OF AUTHORITY FOR THE
ETRUSCANS

268 **VIII. CONCLUSIONS**

268 A. BRIEF SUMMARY

272 B. WIDER PERSPECTIVES

274 **GLOSSARY**

275 **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

VOLUME II

1 **FIGURES AND CHARTS**

PREFACE

This thesis is the result of my own research. During its production, however I have received help and encouragement from a number of people, who I would like to acknowledge here.

Most of all, I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Ruth Whitehouse, for her direction and advice, which took up so much of her time. I would also like to thank Todd Whitelaw, my secondary supervisor, whose background outside Italian archaeology helped give perspective to the work. John Wilkins' advice on the material related to the Etruscan language was tremendously helpful. Thanks also to Harold B. Mattingly for his kind advice on classical literature. Any errors that remain are, of course, my own. In addition, I would like to thank the Faculty of Classics, Cambridge and, in particular Martin Millett, for providing office space and access to the Faculty Library, without which, finishing this thesis would have been extremely difficult.

My work has benefited greatly from the support of graduate students and recent graduates. I would like to thank Anne Rogerson, who read and commented on parts of this thesis, as well as Jason Lucas, whose help, especially with numerous computer-related problems, was much appreciated.

I probably would not have started or finished the thesis without the support of Roman, whose help has been absolutely indispensable. Last, but not at all least, I would like to thank my parents, Dan and Maureen Murray, for helping me in innumerable ways; however, this work is dedicated to my grandmother, Veronica Miller, who has always taken a great interest in my studies and progress.

This thesis is the product of my own work, and contains no more than 100,000 words, not including the bibliography.

LIST OF TABLES

(found in volume I)

Chapter V

Table V.1. The Use of Votive Deposits at the Ritual Structures

Table V.2. Distribution of the Frieze Plaques by Site

Table V.3. Distribution of VRV plaques

Table V.4. Distribution of Aquarossa-Tuscania plaques

Chapter VI

Table VI.1 *Litui* and their images

Table VI.2. Ceremonial Axes and Knives

LIST OF FIGURES

(found in volume II)

Chapter I

- I.1 Thiessen Polygons of settlement hierarchies of southern Etruria, during a) the Final Bronze Age and b) the Early Iron Age (from Di Gennaro 1982).
- I.2 Rank-size rule technique for three time periods of Southern Etruria (from Guidi 1985).
- I.3 X-tent plot for eighth century BC Etruria (from Stoddart 1987).

Chapter II

- II.1 Urn from Chiusi with lictor scene, date unstated (Tassi Scandone 2001).
- II.2 Frieze plaque from Palestrina, with a figure holding a *lituus* (Andrén 1940).
- II.3 The Vitruvian Model of the Tuscan Temple.
- II.4 The Veii-Rome-Velletri Frieze Plaque Series (from Bruun 1993).
- II.5 ‘Seated Assembly’ Frieze Plaques from a) Velletri (from Andrén 1940) and b) Murlo (Poggio Civitate 1970).
- II.6 Inscription of ‘*calaturus mi*’ from Caere (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- II.7 Sarcophagus of the Magistrate from Tarquinia (from Tarquinia Museo Archeologico Nazionale).
- II.8 Zagreb mummy wrappings (from Bonfante and Bonfante 2002).
- II.9 François Tomb at Vulci (from *Die Etrusker* 2004).
- II.10 Pyrgi plaques (from Bonfante and Bonfante 2002).
- II.11 Cortona tablet (from Bonfante and Bonfante 2002).
- II.12 *Bucchero* cup with ‘*rex*’ inscription from the Regia at Rome (from Cristofani 1990).

Chapter IV

- IV.1 Map of Etruria.
- IV.2 The site of Aquarossa (from Östenberg 1986).
- IV.3 Aquarossa Zone B (from Östenberg 1986).
- IV.4 Aquarossa Zones C and F (from Östenberg 1986).
- IV.5 Aquarossa Zone F (from Wikander O., C. Wikander 1990).
- IV.6 “white on red” style terracotta decoration (from C. Wikander 1988).
- IV.7 Acuarossa frieze plaques (from Strandberg Olofsson 1984).
- IV.8 Antefix of female head (from Stranberg Olofsson 1984).
- IV.9 Castelnuovo Berardegna tombs A, B (from Mangani 1985).
- IV.10 Castelnuovo Berardegna Monumental Complex (from Talocchini 1980).
- IV.11 Murlo Monumental Complex (from Phillip 1993).
- IV.12 Antefix of female head (from *Poggio Civitate* 1970).
- IV.13 Sphinx Monumental Complex (from *Poggio Civitate* 1970).
- IV.14 Murlo ‘Cowboy’ (from Spivey 1997).
- IV.15 Frieze Plaques (from Rathje 1993).
- IV.16 The site of Caere (from Boitani; Cataldi and Pasquinucci 1975).
- IV.17 Plan of the Banditaccia necropolis (from Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 233, after Prayon 1975).
- IV.18 The plateau of Caere with a) the distribution of Villanovan pottery, and b) the

- potential coverage of settlement areas during the Archaic period, major areas listed by name (from Maffei and Nastasi 1990).
- IV.19 Regolini Galassi Tomb (from Canina 1838).
 - IV.20 Vigna Parrocchiale with the 'monumental complex' on the left and the fifth century BC circular structure on the right (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.21 Architectural terracotta of bearded man (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.22 Female head antefix, type V (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.23 Painted frieze plaque of centaurs (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.24 Painted frieze plaque of dogs (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.25 Figured frieze plaque fragments of horse scene (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.26 Subterranean feature at Vigna Parrocchiale a) from above, b) side view (from Cristofani 1992).
 - IV.27 Sant' Antonio a) phase I and b) phase II (from Izzet 1999-2000).
 - IV.28 Sant' Antonio phase III (from Izzet 1999-2000).
 - IV.29 Bronze club votive (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
 - IV.30 Bronze weight votive (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
 - IV.31 Valle della Mola (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
 - IV.32 Montetosto area (from Stopponi 1985).
 - IV.33 Montetosto structure (from Stopponi 1985).
 - IV.34 Map of the Pyrgi area (from Boitani, Cataldi, Pasquinucci 1975).
 - IV.35 Sanctuary of Pyrgi (from Spivey and Stoddart 1990).
 - IV.36 The site of Tarquinia (from Boitani, Cataldi, Pasquinucci 1975).
 - IV.37 View of the Civita Complex excavation area (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
 - IV.38 Plan of the sectors of the Civita Complex (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
 - IV.39 Plan of area alpha and edificio beta (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
 - IV.40 Plan of Ara della Regina (from Romanelli 1948).
 - IV.41 Reconstruction of Ara della Regina (from Romanelli 1948).
 - IV.42 Fragments VRV frieze plaques (from Cataldi 1993).
 - IV.43 Sima of battle scene (from Cataldi 1993).
 - IV.44 Plan of the Central Structure (from Romanelli 1948).
 - IV.45 Fragments VRV frieze plaques a) banqueting scene, b) left procession (from Cataldi 1993; Romanelli 1948).
 - IV.46 Fragment of frieze plaque scene of soldiers walking to the right (from Cataldi 1993).
 - IV.47 Partial plan of the Santuario structure (from Romanelli 1948).
 - IV.48 Gravisca (from Torelli 1971).
 - IV.49 The *lituus*, axe and shield from edificio beta in the Civita Complex (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
 - IV.50 Frieze plaque scene of steers from the Central Structure (from Cataldi 1993).
 - IV.51 Fragment of statue from Ara della Regina, late sixth century (from Romanelli 1948).
 - IV.52 Map of Veii (from Ward-Perkins 1961).
 - IV.53 Pottery density chart for Veii (from Patterson et al. 2000).
 - IV.54 Map of Veii with its surrounding cemeteries (from Ward-Perkins 1961).
 - IV.55 Tomb 5, Monte Michele (from Bartoloni 1983).
 - IV.56 Tomba Campana, Monte Michele (from Steingraber 1985).

- IV.57 Iron Age oval hut (from Stefani 1953).
- IV.58 Macchia Grande structure (from Stefani 1922).
- IV.59 North West gate structure (from Ward-Perkins 1959).
- IV.60 Piazza d'Armi, Early Iron Age Phase (from Stefani 1944).
- IV.61 Piazza d'Armi, second phase (from Stefani 1944).
- IV.62 Frieze plaque fragment of procession going right (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.63 Frieze plaque fragment of panther (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.64 Frieze plaque fragment of felines (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.65 Plan of Campetti structure (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.66 Archaic antefixes from Campetti (from Pallottino 1938/1939).
- IV.67 Frieze plaque fragment of procession to the left (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.68 Frieze plaque fragment of VRV horseriding scene (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.69 Frieze plaque fragment of VRV of left procession (from Giglio 1923).
- IV.70 Frieze plaque fragment of VRV of chariot racing (from Giglio 1923).
- IV.71 Comunità Temple (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.72 Head of female statue (from Moretti Sgubini 2001)
- IV.73 Antefixes of female heads (from Moretti Sgubini 2001)
- IV.74 Frieze plaque fragment of horse scene, very similar to the VRV right procession (from Giglio 1923).
- IV.75 Plan of the Portonaccio Temple (from Colonna 2001).
- IV.76 Frieze plaque fragments, Stefani and Gantz identified as from the VRV series (altered from Stefani 1953).
- IV.77 Antefix of female head (from Colonna 1987).
- IV.78 Ridgepole statues of Hermes, Apollo and Latona (from Spivey 1997).
- IV.79 Portonaccio side view of final phase (from Stefani 1953).
- IV.80 Map of the Castellina del Marangone area (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.81 Plan of Castellina del Marangone site (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.82 Detail of plan with building III (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.83 Fragments of female statue (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.84 Fragments of frieze plaque from the Acquarossa-Tuscania series left procession scene (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.85 Fragments of frieze plaque of scene with steers (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.86 Ivory figurine of female head (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.87 Plan of Punta della Vipera temple structure (area B) and the altar (area C) (from Torelli 1967).
- IV.88 Lead *sors* (from Torelli and La Regina 1968).
- IV.89 Map of the Poggio Buco area (from Bartoloni 1992: fig 7).
- IV.90 Fragments of frieze plaques of procession to the right (from Bartoloni 1992).
- IV.91 Sphinx and stag scene (from Bartoloni 1992).
- IV.92 Fragmented frieze plaque scenes of horseriding to the left (from Bartoloni 1992).
- IV.93 Ara del Tufo at Tuscania (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.94 Fragmented scenes from the Acquarossa-Tuscania frieze plaque series (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.95 Fragmented left procession scene of the Acquarossa-Tuscania frieze plaque series, variant I (from Strandberg Olofsson 1993).
- IV.96 Fragmented right procession scene of the Acquarossa-Tuscania frieze plaque

- series, variant II (from Strandberg Olofsson 1993).
- IV.97 Fragmented sima with cavalry striding procession scene (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.98 Fragmented sima with cavalry galloping procession scene (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.99 Plan of the Cannicella sanctuary (from Andrén 1967).
- IV.100 Antefix of female head from Cannicella (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.101 Marble statue of nude female from Cannicella (from Andrén 1967).
- IV.102 Antefix of Silen head or Achelous from Chiusi (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.103 Antefix of female head from Chiusi (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.104 Antefixes of Silens or Achelous from Vulci (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.105 Votives from the Fonte Veneziana at Arezzo (from Lazzeri 1927).
- IV.106 Spring sanctuary at Marzabotto (from Gualandi 1970).
- IV.107 Bronze votives from the spring sanctuary (from Gualandi 1974).
- IV.108 Regia at Rome, Phases three and four (from Brown 1974-1975).
- IV.109 Regia at Rome, Phase five (Scheffer 1990: 186).
- IV.110 Fragments of frieze plaque scene with minotaur between felines (from Downey 1993).
- IV.111 Plan of the Temple at Velletri (in grey) (from Fortunati 1990).
- IV.112 Reconstruction of the Temple at Velletri (from Fortunati 1990).

Chapter VI

- VI.1.1 Sketch of both statues and photograph of the right statue, from Tomb of the Seated Statues, Ceri, 690-670 BC (from Colonna and von Hase 1984).
- VI.1.2 Ivory *lituus* from Tomb A, Casale Marittimo, early seventh century (Roth-Murray 2001).
- VI.1.3 Trumpet *lituus* from Fossa Votiva 284, Tarquinia, first quarter seventh century (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.4 *Lituus* from Banditaccia, Caere, first quarter of the sixth century (from Spivey 1997).
- VI.1.5 Assembly Scene frieze plaques, Murlo, first quarter of the sixth century BC (from Rathje 1993).
- VI.1.6 *Stele*, “*Avile Tite*”, Volterra, mid sixth century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.7 Bronze augur figure, Lapis Niger, Rome, 550 BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.8 Urn, context unknown, 550 BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.9 Detail of figure with *lituus* from Ara del Tufo, Tuscania, mid-late sixth century (from Strandberg Olofsson 1993).
- VI.1.10 Assembly Scene urn, Chiusi, third quarter of the sixth century BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.11 Assembly Scene urn, late sixth century BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.12 Urn, context unknown, late sixth century BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.13 Tomba degli Auguri (from Steingraber 1985).
- VI.1.14 Painting, Tomba Giocolieri, Tarquinia, 510 BC (from Steingraber 1985).
- VI.1.15 Cippus, augur figure, Fiesole, 6/5th century (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.16 Possible altar with sacrifice scene, unknown context, beginning of fifth century (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.2.1 Bronze Axes, Tomb of the Warrior, Tarquinia, second half of the eighth century BC (Hencken 1968).

- VI.2.2 Miniature Axe, Bologna, mid-eighth to early seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.3 Axe, Chiusi, ziro tomb- via Cassia, late eighth to early seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.4 Knives from Statonia, the necropolis of Poggio Buco (from Matteucig 1951).
- VI.2.5 Axe, Tarquinia, Fossa 284, *edificio beta*, first quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.6 Axe, Casale Marittimo, Tomb A, first quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.7 Axe, Casale Marittimo, Tomb H1, second quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.8 Axe, Casale Marittimo, Tomb H2, second quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.9 Axe, Trestina, seventh century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.2.10 *Bucchero* axe, Tarquinia, Tomb on Poggio Gallinaro, mid-seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.11 *Fasces*, Vetulonia, Tomba del Littore, 630-625 BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2001).
- VI.2.12 Miniature clay hatchet Sarteano, 630-601 BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.2.13 Vetulonia, Funeral *stele* end of seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.14 Bronze knife, context unknown, seventh to sixth century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.15 Image of Axe, Veii, Tomba Campana, 600 BC (from Steingräber 1985).
- VI.2.16 Images of two knives and one double axe in the frieze plaques from Murlo, Poggio Civitate c 600 BC (from Rathje 1993).
- VI.2.17 Sandstone *stele*, “*Larthie Ninie*”, Fiesole, first half of the sixth century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.2.18 Image of knife, Tarquinia, Tomba dei Tori, mid-sixth century BC (from Steingräber 1985).
- VI.2.19 Image of knives, Chiusi, Urn with sacrifice scene, 550 BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.2.20 Judgment of Paris (from Steuernagel 1998).
- VI.3.1 Detail of the VRV left procession, the Acquarossa-Tuscania right procession and the Murlo procession (altered from Bruun 1993; Wikander, C; Wikander, O. 1988; Rathje 1993).
- VI.3.2 Distribution of Chariots in tombs according to gender (from Emiliozzi 1999).
- VI.3.3 ‘Boccanera’ painted plaques, mid-sixth century, from Banditaccia, Caere (from Spivey 1997).
- VI.3.4 Fruit or flower-shaped *plectrum*, second half of the seventh century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.3.5 Sceptre with a flower-shaped finial, Tomba Barberini, Palestrina, seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.3.6 Detail of the VRV ‘seated assembly’ scene frieze plaque (altered from Bruun 1993).
- VI.3.7 Urn depicting two male figures, late sixth century (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.3.8 Detail of wall painting from the Tomba Giocolieri at Tarquinia, dated to 510 BC (from Steingräber 1985).

LIST OF CHARTS

(found in volume II)

Chapter V

Chart V.1 Chronology of the Ritual Structures

Chart V.2 Frieze Plaque Themes Represented in Total

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AA</i>	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AttiMGrecia</i>	<i>Atti e Memorie della Società Magna Grecia</i>
<i>ArchCl</i>	<i>Archeologia Classica</i>
<i>ARP</i>	<i>Accordia Research Papers</i>
<i>BPI</i>	<i>Bulletino della Paleontologia Italiana</i>
<i>CAJ</i>	<i>Cambridge Archaeological Journal</i>
<i>DArch</i>	<i>Dialoghi d'Archeologia</i>
<i>Deliciae Fictiles</i>	Rystedt, E., C. Wikander and Ö. Wikander 1993 <i>Deliciae Fictiles. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Central Italic Architectural Terracottas of the Swedish Institute in Rome, December 1990, Stockholm: Afström.</i>
<i>JAnthArch</i>	<i>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>MonAnt</i>	<i>Monumenti Antichi dell'Accademia dei Lincei</i>
<i>NotScav</i>	<i>Notizie degli Scavi dell'Antichità</i>
<i>OCD</i>	<i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary (3rd Edition)</i>
<i>OpAth</i>	<i>Opuscula Atheniensia</i>
<i>OpRom</i>	<i>Opuscula Romana</i>
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
<i>RA</i>	<i>Révue Archéologique</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Realenzyklopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>

RM

*Mitteilungen des Deutschen
Archäologischen Instituts (Römische
Abteilung)*

StEtr

Studi Etruschi

I. INTRODUCTION

This project has grown organically, it was initially planned to research the role of ritual in developing social structures, as well as to offer a response to the many views inherent in Etruscan studies suggesting that the social systems of the Etruscans are clearly understood (cf. Torelli 1988). Upon beginning, I was struck by three main points: the sheer volume of data concerning excavation reports and the material culture, the reliance upon Greece and Rome as reference points for viewing the Etruscans, and the common binary division of viewing the Etruscans either through funerary or ritual contexts. This has led to oversimplified explanations related to Etruscan life. Working backwards from the later developments of Rome relies on inductive reasoning. In addition, viewing Etruscan art as a by-product of Greek contact, neglects the unique artistic and creative indigenous developments. The overwhelming, albeit often problematic, data illustrate how heterogeneous the developments of social organisations were across central Italy.

The Orientalising and Archaic periods marked major transitions in the lifeways across central Italy, particularly for the Etruscans. During the eighth century BC many new settlements and associated necropoleis developed in the region. These changes demonstrated not only the physical construction of more visible remains, but the creation of societies organised along different and more permanent lines. This consisted of a gradual process of continual change over two centuries. As communities across Etruria formed in their own right, relations grew with neighbouring communities, as well as cultures from across the Mediterranean. Never before had there been so many factors affecting the development of these settlements, made most apparent by the rise of differential access to wealth and the creation of more specialised statuses related to the new social spheres and activities.

It is crucial to view the development of the Etruscan societies as individual entities not dependent on the catalyst of contact with other cultures in Italy or across the Mediterranean. Etruscan developments are often inappropriately seen as the by-products of influence from the Greek world or Rome (Boardman 1964; Cornell 1995).

When a long-term view is used, however, it is apparent that many of the changes are the result of gradual transformations rooted fundamentally in Etruscan culture.

This project entails a new and different approach to understanding the social developments of the Etruscans during the Orientalising and Archaic periods, by investigating the creation of settlements, ritual structures and iconographic systems, in relation to the creation of new social statuses. The use of a multi-contextual approach, combining information from funerary, domestic and ritual contexts, allows for the widest possible understanding of how change in one area of social life can lead to changes elsewhere. Investigating the use of iconography in all of these spheres at each settlement demonstrates specific messages being communicated within communities. Changes in the development of the settlements and their iconography can then be seen as creating links or barriers between different settlements. The form of the settlements, as seen in their spatial organisation, as well as in monumental architecture for funerary, domestic and ritual purposes, in addition to the associated iconography, relates directly to the creation of special statuses. These allowed individuals to hold control over these structures and the activities associated with them.

The initial idea for the project began as an effort to understand the drastic contrasts in the nature of ritual and social hierarchy in central Italy between the early prehistoric periods and the well-attested late Archaic period. There is a clear gap in knowledge between these two periods, often referred to as the 'proto-historic' period. The original emphasis was to address the potential importance of ritual in social hierarchy and the development of settlements in Etruria, spurred on by a discussion of the necessity to acknowledge the importance of ritual as being integral to understanding the rest of a culture's social organisation (Whitehouse 1995). The link between ritual and social organisation probably relied initially on the power of certain individuals, and their control over religious knowledge and ritual practices. Whitehouse focuses on the transition of the nature of ritual from the Neolithic to the Late Bronze Age. Neolithic society was characterised by small-scale secret ritual located in caves, where religion was embedded in society and leadership extended to other spheres of social life. During the Copper and Bronze Ages, a high degree of continuity was

maintained in the location of ritual spaces in caves, although changes in social organisation toward more differentiation in burial, including the introduction of funerary monuments related to funerary ritual, are apparent. This new public aspect of ritual, Whitehouse argues, shows a definite change of powerful statuses being made public. By the Middle Bronze Age in central Italy a small number of open-air cult sites is created, and cult sites cease to be located in caves, particularly in Etruria during the Late Bronze Age. By the sixth century, temples and city-states exist in central Italy, showing a full progression of ritual in the open public (Guidi 1990: 409; Whitehouse 1995: 83-87).

This project addresses the issue raised by Whitehouse, namely that ritual must be included, as an active element to society, rather than as a passive one, in investigations into the development of society in Italy. The Etruscans have been the focus of much work over the years discussing a wide range of issues, such as their origins, cultural and artistic developments, settlement hierarchies and their relationships with Rome. The following sections give a brief overview to the background of Etruscan research.

A. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE ETRUSCANS

1. TRADITIONAL APPROACHES

A considerable amount of work has been done on investigating the social structures of the Etruscan culture. Here, only the research which comments on the social and political developments of the Etruscans will be discussed, because there are countless others that focus on single aspects of Etruscan culture. Many of the early works focus on the origin of the Etruscans, often attributing them to north of the Alps (Pigorini 1903; Colini 1908), central Europe (Hencken 1959, 1968), or the Balkans (Trump 1958), based on elements shared with other cultures with regard to language and metalwork. Ancient literature was also concerned with the origins of the 'Etruscan race'. For instance, the Greek historian Herodotus states that the 'Tyrrhenians' were forced by famine to leave Lydia c. 1300 BC. However, another Greek historian, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, argues that the Etruscans were indigenous to Italy. In fact, there is no direct archaeological evidence and little historical documentary

evidence to support an invasion hypothesis. Designating the Etruscan culture as a transplanted one, meant that the 'complexities' and 'advances' in central Italy were seen as the direct result of foreign cultures that replaced any indigenous developments.

These views gradually lost support after numerous excavations indicated continuity between the Villanovan and Etruscan phases of sites. Pallottino initiated the idea by stating that the 'civilization of ancient Etruria did not grow entirely from foreign seeds', in fact, the sites that become the great historical centres of Etruria develop from the early 'Villanovan' times to historical times without break (Pallottino 1956: 70-71). Pallottino also argued that the Etruscan people had been mistakenly oversimplified as a single unit, whose development can be explained through one event. Rather than discuss the potential provenance of an entire culture, the integral elements of ethnicity, language, politics and culture should be investigated as to their origin and development. From this, it can be understood that 'the formative process of the nation *can only have taken place on the territory of Etruria proper*' (Pallottino 1956: 69) [author's own use of italics].

During the early part of the last century, two distinct traditions developed, in regards to studying the Etruscan culture. The Italian tradition, of which Pallottino was one of the main exponents, is based on Classical Archaeology. This approach relies heavily on ancient literary sources, as well as excavation. Because of this, many of the terms used to describe social organisation are borrowed directly from the ancient literature, including 'king', 'prince' or 'praetor'. By contrast, the Anglo-American tradition is based heavily upon Geography, Prehistoric Archaeology and Anthropology. The result is an emphasis on survey, mapping and excavation. The Anglo-American tradition relies on anthropological/archaeological models and terms to describe social organisation, and includes the terms 'band', 'tribe', 'chiefdom' and 'state'. This is, of course, a generalisation (the Italian scholars di Gennaro and Guidi do not fully follow the Italian tradition), but the majority of work conducted on the Etruscans does generally fall into one of these two categories. Neither tradition is necessarily better than the other; however, both must be recognised as affecting the conclusions that are

drawn. In both, the descriptive terms used may be inappropriate; this will be discussed in the next section.

2. LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

Developments in Landscape Archaeology have also greatly affected the study of Etruscan power structures. Dennis was the first to treat the region of Etruria as a whole topographical entity (1883). Other topographical studies continued, such as Pallottino's survey of Tarquinia (1937), and Lugli's map of the territory of Rome (finally published 1962), but it was not until Ward Perkins became the director of the British School at Rome that the archaeological sites and topography of South Etruria began to be intensively surveyed and recorded. The project continued for twenty-five years, covered nearly 1000 square kilometers, and recorded nearly 2000 sites. The aims of the South Etruria project grew over time to include diachronic coverage of many of the areas from pre-Roman to medieval times, and led to small-scale excavations to define the chronology.

Potter continued this tradition of the South Etruria project and set forth a clear methodology, which included a regional focus that could also acknowledge the inter-relationships between sites, as well as a temporal focus to study the development of the areas from the first inhabitants to modern times. The survey data were then extended to include more excavation, aerial photography and paleobotanical evidence (Potter 1979: 10), as well as the investigation of how changes in the climate affected the past landscapes and placement of settlements. Potter also acknowledged the problems involved in the analysis. For instance, successive occupation, deep ploughing and monumental building techniques all obscure the earliest phases of settlement, especially the minor settlement structures. The result is significant gaps in the distribution maps of older phases of settlement (Potter 1979: 11-28). His work has been continued as part of the Tiber Valley Project, which has recently demonstrated the further potential of recognising cultural change through the landscape (Patterson et al. 2004: esp. 6).

In the 1980s, mathematical models from the fields of statistics and geography began to be applied to the area of Etruria. Di Gennaro used Thiessen Polygons to analyse

the settlement hierarchies of Southern Etruria during the Final Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age (1982) (Figure I.1). This was an effort to view the region of Southern Etruria as an entity, the changes of which in territorial organisation could represent the political and economic development therein. The Thiessen Polygons were created around each Etruscan site by drawing a line at the midpoint between each two neighbouring sites. These lines represented the approximate territorial boundaries between the sites, some of which were adjusted to reflect natural boundaries such as mountain ranges and water courses (di Gennaro 1982: 107,110). Di Gennaro felt it was necessary to use only well-substantiated sites of considerable size, and therefore used only 70 of the roughly 150 known Final Bronze Age sites in Etruria. He felt secure that his reconstruction of the territorial boundaries of the settlements could possibly be improved, but not 'revolutionized' by new research.

Di Gennaro asserted, however, that there is a break in the occupation at many of the settlements between the Final Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age (di Gennaro 1982: 108). Recent surveys indicate, however, that almost every settlement in Southern Etruria shows continuity in occupation layers between these periods (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 45). The continuity in the existence of the sites is also an important factor in understanding the settlement hierarchy and territorial boundaries. Di Gennaro concluded that the well-known Etruscan centres of Vulci, Volsinii, Tarquinia, Caere and Veii were the biggest Villanovan centres in the Early Iron Age in Southern Etruria (1982: 110). His conclusions, however, seem to be at odds with the actual distribution of Thiessen Polygons. It seems that they are based more on general knowledge of Etruria from excavations, rather than on his polygons. It is true that the five settlements di Gennaro concentrated on are important centres; however this is not apparent from his figures. According to di Gennaro's figures, the polygons for Tarquinia and Caere are surrounded by equally small polygons, while those of Vulci, Veii and Volsinii are relatively large polygons that do not seem to interrelate spatially to the surrounding large to medium-sized polygons. These two different types of spatial orientation for the Thiessen Polygons of these specific sites may well imply very different conclusions. Di Gennaro's Thiessen Polygons seem to suggest that the areas of Ischia di Castro, Tarquinia, Allumiere, Santa Marinella, Caere, Castel Campanile and others were important areas during the Early Iron Age, with other

settlements clustering around them as part of a possible economic network. This is potentially interesting because many of these sites did not continue to be successful after the Orientalising Period.

Di Gennaro's study would be greatly aided by also incorporating other factors, as he mentioned himself while quoting the work of Bietti Sestieri, including: demography, settlement characteristics, economy, social structure and other geographical features (di Gennaro 1982: 102, citing Bietti Sestieri 1981: 223-364). The potential population sizes of the settlements, estimated from factors such as approximate number of burials, the types of industry present, the character of the earliest differentiated burials, the locations of the sites in relation to the coast and rich mineral sources, as well as the area occupied by the site, are all important factors in the development of Southern Etruria. It would be interesting to note how closely polygons that reflect these factors correspond to di Gennaro's original Thiessen Polygons, although this is not totally feasible with the current means of creating polygon distributions.

Renfrew discussed the development of Etruria through his Peer Polity Interaction model (1986). As part of the discussion, he uses Thiessen Polygons to show the spatial organization of the 'twelve ancient cities of Etruria'. Renfrew views Etruria as one example of peer polity interaction at work, that is, a collection of several autonomous political centres with separate territorial units and administrative systems, that together develops and constitutes a 'civilisation'. These separate 'states' often actively enforce independence and competitiveness, while having similar political institutions, weights and measurement systems, writing systems, religious beliefs and the same spoken language. It is the interactions between these separate but intertwined states/villages that result in 'structural homologies' such as similar monumental architecture. Renfrew emphasizes that the interactions between the polities of equal rank, rather than exogenous or endogenous influences, stimulate change regionally and can initiate the creation of a nation state. The majority of interactions can be divided into groups of: warfare, competitive emulation, symbolic entrainment, transmission of innovation and the increased flow of exchange (Renfrew 1986: 2-8).

The Peer Polity Interaction model marks a change in the way areas, like Etruria, can be viewed. Neither the traditional views of mostly exogenous influences affecting Etruscan development, nor the counter arguments of completely endogenous influences creating the Etruscan culture, fully allow us to examine the interactions between the separate settlements as an impetus behind development. It is, however precisely the different types of interactions between the settlements that must be investigated. The dominance or emphasis of particular interactions, I would argue, influences the character of the social and political structure at each settlement. For instance, a predominance of warfare activities could bring about a system of leadership capable of organising an army, or a predominance of exchanging goods could bring about a system of leadership capable of organising the production and distribution of these goods. It may be possible to identify the predominance of one or other of these activities through the types of monumental structures and the iconography of the elite. All of this being said, in the case of Etruria, outside influence also needs to be considered as an important, but not solely defining, factor in the development of the area.

Another mathematical model was used by Guidi, which applied the rank-size rule technique for three time periods in both southern Etruria and *Latium vetus* (old Latium) (1985) (Figure I.2). Guidi sought to trace the changes in regional settlement organisation and integration from the Bronze Age chiefdoms to the beginnings of urbanisation in the Iron Age. The rank-size rule is another way of considering size-frequency distributions. Guidi incorporated this by ranking the settlements according to their size, in descending order, and in relation to their region and time phase. The settlement extents are borrowed from di Gennaro's study. Each group of settlements was then plotted on a graph with rank on the x-axis, and size (in hectares) on the y-axis. The resulting lines were compared to a log-normal line, slope of -1, which is produced using the largest settlement present. The shape of the observed line in relation to log-normal, conveys the relationship between the settlements since log-normal is intended to convey the 'ideal' distribution of settlements in a state system where the settlements are characterised by a high degree of integration (Guidi 1985: 222).

According to rank-size rule, the size of any ranked settlement should be the inverse of its rank, in relation to the largest settlement in the study. For instance, a settlement ranked second in a group should be half as large as the first and largest settlement (Johnson 1981: 145). The two main deviations from log-normal are also capable of revealing the types of organisation that existed between the settlements. Primate distributions consist of a concave line, as compared to the linear log-normal line, resulting from a large number of settlements that are smaller than the rank-size rule would predict. The relatively small number of large centres present in primate distributions indicates a 'primacy' or dominance of a few settlements over large areas. Convex distributions, on the other hand, consist of a group of settlements where the middle to small range of settlements are larger than the rank-size rule would predict, showing a supposed non-state formation, and little integration and political hierarchy between the settlements (Johnson 1981: 150).

Guidi believed that the deviations of the observed distribution lines are able to explain the development and organisation of the settlements in both areas, when compared to the log-normal distributions. Phase I (tenth century BC) contains convex distributions, showing low integration levels, for both Etruria and Latium. Many changes occur in phase II (ninth century BC): Etruria has a dramatic drop in the number of sites, whilst three different size categories began to form more distinctly; the number of sites in Latium did not change, but similarly sized categories between the settlements became more obvious. Whilst both distribution curves are still convex, Etruria began to come much closer to log-normal (Guidi 1985: 224). In phase III (eighth century BC), Etruria appeared much the same as the previous phase, although there is an increase in the number of settlements and the hierarchy of settlement sizes continued to become a more gradual one. Similarly, Latium experienced an increase in settlement numbers, this time with the appearance of considerably larger sites. Both curves on the rank-size distribution graph for phase III came even closer to matching the log-normal curve, with Latium still slightly convex and Etruria showing a potentially high degree of integration between its settlements (Guidi 1985: 228).

Rendeli has critiqued the work conducted by Guidi. One concern is that inaccuracies

in the measurements of the site areas affect Guidi's results. In Rendeli's view, which relates more to the rank-size rule itself, it is problematic that the graphs show static views of the regions in different time periods, giving the impression the transformations were sudden (Rendeli 1993: 107). Other potential problems with the rank-size rule exist. Convex distributions can be created unintentionally by 'pooling' or 'partitioning' systems. The adding of sites that belong to other systems, or failing to include a large site, are 'easily made' mistakes, but can have severe implications for the accuracy of the rank-size distribution (Johnson 1981: 167). The two main causes of these problems are, according to Johnson, survey coverage and site size estimation. The surveys must include data from the entire region being studied to avoid missing relevant settlements. It must also be understood that there is no necessarily direct relationship between the extent of a settlement and its population size (Johnson 1981: 176).

In his doctoral thesis (1987), Simon Stoddart investigated the spatial and political development of the state, or 'complex polities' as he terms them, in Etruria and Umbria from 1200-500 BC. The organisation of the settlements throughout the different phases is determined by employing the rank-size rule and Xtent software, in an attempt to understand the 'function and interrelationships of the settlements as a process of political development' (Stoddart 1987: 6). Primary centres are identified by the extent of habitation or the number of inscriptions present at the site. The graphic 'tents' created in the Xtent programme show the most probable areas of political influence of the various centres in the regions (Rendeli 1993: 112).

Stoddart concluded that different areas, including *Latium vetus*, southern Etruria, coastal northern Etruria, inland northern Etruria, and Umbria, developed in different ways and at different rates (Stoddart 1987; 1990). The development of *Latium vetus* took a traditional route with settlements ranging across all sizes, characterized by a rank-size distribution close to log-normal. This illustrates a characteristic central place system with a structured settlement hierarchy. In South Etruria and coastal North Etruria a few dominant centres controlled the political landscape, and lacked medium- to small-sized settlements (Figure I.3). The findings show less integration in the last two areas under study. Inland North Etruria was, by contrast, characterised by

a decentralised political landscape with a traditional primate system of a few large, dominant centres and several small settlements. Umbria contained a very under-developed political landscape, consisting of a few medium- to small-sized settlements (Stoddart 1987: 280; 1990: 45). Many factors brought about the differential development of the various regions. Southern Etruria may have developed more readily into a peer polity system due to connections with the rest of the Mediterranean world from 800 BC onwards, whilst conversely, Umbria may have developed more slowly due to its geographically less advantageous location (Stoddart 1987: 286).

In a more general publication, Spivey and Stoddart use a variety of sources to discuss the development of the Etruscans (1990). One of the main foci, however, is settlement hierarchy in Etruria, based in part on di Gennaro's work. Spivey and Stoddart attempt to link the size and distribution of settlements and the degree of activity around them with the socio-economic development of Etruria (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 61). They believe that the territory developed through inter-site politics. In the Late Bronze Age a settlement pattern emerged, according to Spivey and Stoddart, with 65% of known settlements in South Etruria being located on plateaux for defensive positions, with a regular distribution to create physical and social distances between neighbouring settlements. The majority of these sites remained relatively small and do not indicate complex internal organisation. They believe that by the Villanovan period, the 'human landscape of South Etruria was undeniably revolutionized', with regularly spaced settlements occupying large areas on the plateaux surrounded by the developing necropoleis. Although the degree of control held by the larger settlements over the surrounding territories and the smaller settlements is difficult to assess, Spivey and Stoddart propose that the use of XTent mathematical modelling illustrates the most accurate territorial boundaries for the Villanovan period. The XTent models take into account relative size of the settlements, geographical boundaries, and unlike Thiessen Polygons, the ability to leave unoccupied space between the proposed territorial boundaries (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 43-47).

Spivey and Stoddart emphasise that external influences were not the primary cause behind socio-political changes in central Italy between c. 1200-800 BC (Spivey and

Stoddart 1990: 80). During the Orientalizing period, however, the material culture was revolutionised partly due to imported objects, which they argue, were exploited by new social groups who altered the organisation of the settlements. The former major Villanovan centres expanded their territories at this point and began organising the settlements internally and colonising smaller settlements, while at the same time new settlements were created that, Spivey and Stoddart believe, were independent and located intentionally on the territorial edges of the major Villanovan centres. They propose that there were 'zones beyond the political control of the major centres (the 'free corridors')', such as Acquarossa, Marsiliana d'Albegna, Murlo and Bisenzio. These sites existed in the marginal, buffer zones, until they were destroyed by their more powerful neighbours. Many of the other sites in Etruria became urbanised during the sixth century BC, with monumental construction using different techniques, including rectilinear structures. Gradually, during the Archaic period, many of the small sites surrounding the major centres were destroyed as these centres increased their territorial control (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 52-55).

3. BEYOND LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

Spivey and Stoddart attribute the organisation of early Etruscan society to a framework of kinship, which manifests itself in the possible 'oligarchic' political system and burial rites (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 140). The development of cemeteries in Etruria helps clarify the development of the societies themselves. In the Final Bronze Age, cemeteries of fewer than fifty graves indicate a sense of community, although not necessarily long-lived at most sites. These small cremation cemeteries with little differentiation suggest what was often referred to as a possible 'egalitarian' society (or more likely, a society that does not make overtly visible social differentiations within burials that could signify permanent ranking). The cemeteries began in the Villanovan period to show a dramatic increase in burial numbers and are clearly tied to nearby settlements. The cemeteries surrounding single settlements often remained distinct from each other, probably representing the separate identities of kinship groups. Differences in wealth also began being expressed in burials during this period, especially in the late structures. From the seventh century, large chamber tombs began to be constructed for elite individuals, and the more monumental means of burial became available to a larger section of the populace. It was also during the

seventh century that Etruscan art began to employ the iconography of the new elite. Spivey and Stoddart assert that the elite acted as patrons commissioning art to express the symbolism involved in the socio-political hierarchy (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 140-148).

Some of Spivey and Stoddart's methods for reconstructing the settlement hierarchies for the Final Bronze Age in central Italy seem problematic. Their reliance on field survey data does not fully acknowledge the limitations of these data, and the possibility that other contemporary sites existed in the valleys and lowlands, but have not been recovered in great numbers. The proposed 'regular spacing' and 'free corridors' are equally difficult to support firmly on field survey data alone, and if di Gennaro's Thiessen Polygons are accurate, then the settlement spacing is not highly regular, but rather consists of two main clusters in South Etruria. The main criticisms are, however, that territorial boundaries may not best be tested mathematically, and equally importantly, that knowing the territorial boundaries would not necessarily improve our understanding of the existing social and political structures. The inter-relationships between the settlements may possibly be better defined by directly examining the material culture from these sites for signs of exchange, influence and relative amounts of weaponry, as well as the defences of sites (symbolic or real) for indications of needing protection from warring neighbours. Also, it is problematic to imply that Acquarossa, Marsiliana d'Albegna, Murlo and Bisenzio were destroyed because of their location on the margins of large centres. It is difficult to assess realistically which areas the Etruscans considered central or marginal during this period, while the sites in question seem to have been prosperous themselves, and there are many other sites equidistant from 'centres' that continued to prosper after the Archaic period, rather than be destroyed (such as: Vignale, Narce, Sutri and Ceri). The duration of the Etruscan settlements is a complicated issue involving the political, social and economic structures at work. A general geographical or mathematical approach is unlikely to discover the unique circumstances present at each settlement.

Another general work, by Barker and Rasmussen (1998), broadly discusses the development of the Etruscan culture from the first settlers of central Italy to the Roman period. Barker and Rasmussen view the landscape of the area as an integral

component of the cultural developments (1998: 10). The topics discussed include Etruscan origins, material culture, burial practices, rituals and contacts with other cultures, based on field survey and other archaeological evidence, as well as classical literary references. Employing a social evolutionary model while discussing the development of the Etruscan culture, Barker and Rasmussen assert that the first chiefdoms of central Italy probably developed during the Late Bronze Age (c. 1100-900 BC) (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 53). They cite evidence such as: changes in burial practices for a small percentage of the burials, seeming to indicate high-status individuals; the relocation of many settlements from all levels of the topography, including the lowlands and caves, onto promontories; changes in the economy, including intensification of new crops; the possible increase of population sizes; the construction of large residences, at sites such as Sorgenti della Nova; regional trading; and the creation of cemeteries (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 53-59). With these developments in mind, contacts with Phoenicians and Greeks are seen as a 'symptom of Villanovan social intensification rather than its cause'. Phenomena such as competitive interaction and 'ritualized friendship' within the region are seen as the main stimuli for the cultural transformations that occurred in Etruria between roughly 1000-700 BC, and importantly, these changes should be viewed as parallel experiences to those of Greece, not as a later result of events in Greece (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 84).

Barker and Rasmussen deal with virtually all of the available data types for the Etruscans, with very up-to-date information. They also deal with the topics of subsistence strategies and the economy in a more dynamic way than do Spivey and Stoddart, by incorporating archaeobotanical and archaeozoological evidence, and findings of agricultural tools, with engineering feats. Similar to Spivey and Stoddart, the purpose of the book is a discussion of the development of the culture by showcasing different viewpoints and data, making it an excellent resource for beginning an investigation.

B. THE DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROJECT

In contrast to some of the past works, this investigation is not directed at pinpointing state formation or territorial boundaries and settlement hierarchies. Rather than determining which settlements became dominant and how much territory fell under their control, I am investigating the creation and transformation of authoritative statuses during the Orientalising and Archaic periods, through their representation in new forms of architecture and iconography. In fact, the destruction of some of the sites in question may have resulted from the types of authority utilised by the leaders. The focus lies on defining the means of power (i.e. special skills and valour in particular, rather than economics and politics) and how this is expressed in the construction of the settlement with monuments, ritual spaces and defences, as well as the construction of identities through burial practices, ritual practices and iconography (i.e. warrior, elite life, social representation and mythological themes). Elements from this period can be shown to demonstrate the existence of these factors while the settlements were being constructed. It is also probable that these factors varied in emphasis at each site over time, rather than a single type of power base being utilised across Etruria.

This project also differs from the works previously described with regard to how the data are handled. This thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter II is divided into two halves. The first explores and defines several issues and terms, which are central to my investigation, including the views on defining authority and its manifestations. The second half includes a discussion of social evolutionary and agency theories, and proposes a possible resolution. Chapter III consists of a literature review, discussing works directly related to this project, and offers a critical discussion of many of the previous approaches. It is divided into three main sections, the first of which covers works related to the rise of social power for the Etruscans, while the second covers works related to the development of ritual structures for the Etruscans, and the third explores how linguistic-based approaches have affected the study of Etruscan society. Chapter IV is a presentation of the data pertaining to each of the sites. This is divided into three sections of: sites which survive past the sixth century BC, sites which do not survive into the fifth century BC, and sites with little information. The data from

each site is organised into categories of: funerary, settlement and ritual contexts (where possible in each case), in an effort to consider all of the related and necessary evidence. The first section will deal with the funerary contexts. This will cover particular tombs and grave goods that may indicate the existence of special, authoritative statuses; it will not involve a comprehensive analysis of the tombs and grave goods, but rather a strategically selected sample of data that are particularly relevant to this study. The second section will describe the general development of the site, and will include historical references, and in a few cases, inscriptions which include terms describing special statuses. The third will describe the ritual contexts, including ritual structures and votive deposits. The monumental ritual architecture will be examined in terms of form and spatial organisation, and considered in terms of possible functions as temples and palaces, which may relate to the political organisation of the settlements.

In Chapter V, the form of the ritual structures present at each site is discussed at greater length, particularly in relation to the development of iconography related to the structures. The iconography associated with the monumental ritual structures will be investigated in an attempt to examine the use of iconography related to the construction of authoritative statuses in at least the ritual sphere. Several elements that are found to recur in the iconography of more than one structure will be examined more closely to understand their meanings and effectiveness in different contexts. The area under study will be opened-up in Chapter VI by taking the elements of iconography from the ritual contexts selected in Chapter V to be examined in comparison with other examples from settlement and funerary contexts across the region, which relate to special statuses. Five elements of iconography are focused on, namely *litui*, axes, chariots, fruit- or flower-like ornaments, and sceptres. These will also be investigated to establish any patterning between the objects and their physical context, as part of the discussion of the possible symbolic meanings of the objects. These categories of data have been discussed in some of the previous works; however, they have not been integrated to investigate specifically the development of hierarchical societies for the Etruscans.

Chapter VII is a presentation of my interpretations. The development of each site, and its survival or destruction are discussed in terms of its ritual sphere and iconography. It will be shown that developments in the ritual sphere are mirrored in the funerary and settlement contexts including: monumental architecture, ritual practices and iconography, demonstrating the different types of authority present at the sites. The different types of authority utilised were directly related to the survival of entire, or parts of, sites. All of this represents a major transition at the end of the sixth century BC across the region. Chapter VIII draws together the conclusions, and suggests further areas of study.

The evidence will be limited in time, to the seventh and sixth centuries BC, focusing on the period when the settlements began to develop on the plateaux, a small percentage of tombs became monumentalised with differentiated grave goods, the use of writing appeared in restricted form, and iconography depicting elites, rituals and mythological figures began to be seen. These types of evidence will be juxtaposed in a new way, in order to investigate how the development of these sites coincides with the development of the elites present. Each site in question will be investigated separately to identify the different circumstances present, instead of viewing Etruria as one homogenous unit or as even as two (i.e. the North and South). Only then can a larger picture of potential patterns relating small areas or regions become evident. Many of the settlements cannot provide a full picture of funerary, settlement and ritual contexts, due to the nature of the data (see discussion in the 'Limitations' section). One site in particular, Veii, has a wealth of well-published material, and is presented here as the ideal case study of how the methodology should function with the categories of data.

Another important difference is the level at which the data will be investigated. This project focuses on the actions of individuals and groups of individuals as the basic and crucial level of stimulus for cultural change. In addition, it argues that individuals or groups of individual agents act within the landscape and within the pre-existing systems of social life, rather than in isolation. Much of the past research conducted on the Etruscans has focused on the social group writ large, considering the Etruscans as one cohesive group spanning several centuries, by discussing them through general

topics of: The Land, The People, The Economy, The Religion, The Language and The Art. The unique developments that occurred at the sites in question, particularly during the seventh and sixth centuries BC, would be more appropriately examined separately, rather than as parts of a composite structure that form a homogenous culture.

Most of the evidence utilised in the project relies on field survey and excavation results. Some classical literature will also be used to illustrate (albeit from foreign and later viewpoints) corresponding useful descriptions of Etruscan practices and leadership roles. The limitations and problems involved in using excerpts of classical literature will of course be addressed. As opposed to other 'classically imposed' models, the use of classical literature will be neither anecdotal nor will it be the core onto which the archaeological evidence is shaped. The excerpts of classical literature are problematic for many reasons, and cannot be considered factual evidence; some passages stand in direct opposition to the archaeological findings. Careful weighing of both the archaeological and literary evidence can, however, clarify some of the questions that are being asked.

The results of this project show the degree of diversity amongst several Etruscan settlements, as well as a network of connections between some of them. Were this project to begin again, the data set would be chosen differently, not by apparent regions, e.g. Etruria, but have a wider scope of central Italy. Interesting connections were found with Latin sites, Rome, Velletri and Satricum, in particular. Integrating them into this investigation might have been more appropriate, but would have gone beyond the scope of a thesis.

C. LIMITATIONS

The approach of this project involves utilising data in a new way. Data from multiple contexts, which are often kept in isolation, will be juxtaposed for a wider perspective. The sites have been viewed initially as separate entities in order to appreciate the unique developments, before grouping them according to similarities (which will be

discussed in Chapter IV). The dataset is not without its problems; however, it will be shown that the manner in which the data are used affects its reliability.

There are several limitations to my study, which must be acknowledged, some of which are due to the nature of the data. The majority of research conducted on Etruscan topics has focused primarily on the necropoleis and temples, and for obvious reasons. Settlement data are rare, sometimes owing to modern communities being located directly on top of the ancient site or, possibly more often, owing to a lack of survey and excavation. Consequently, the body of settlement data, consisting of a small number of sites or parts of sites (Acquarossa, Caere, Marzabotto, Murlo, Roselle, Veii, etc) could possibly provide misleading examples of “Etruscan town-planning”, if used as a template.

Focusing on the necropoleis and temples has its pitfalls. The spatial organisation of the necropoleis is often used as a substitute for town planning evidence. Even some of the tombs themselves, such as the Tomb of the Thatched Roof in Caere, and cremation urns that resemble huts are seen as examples of Etruscan domestic architecture, even though it is not at all certain if funerary architecture actually reflects the domestic architecture (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 77-78). However, one of the main problems with the funerary evidence is, inevitably, tomb robbing and antiquarian ‘collecting’. Tomb robbing has occurred since antiquity, with many of the grave goods being distributed in private collections around the world. As a result, the pottery from Etruscan contexts, which comes almost exclusively from tombs, cannot be studied comprehensively (this issue will be discussed in more detail in section D of this chapter). This is also a problem with bronze votive offerings, which became a hot commodity for collection for several centuries. Many votive objects, however, have been returned to museums without, of course, contextual information.

Another obvious concern is information from excavations conducted during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The interests of these excavations rarely included stratigraphy, exact locations of grave goods, or details of skeletal material. On the other hand, many “temples” have been excavated, and in recent years, there has been some debate as to what constitutes ritual space (Edlund 1987: 30-38;

Damgaard Andersen 1993: 71). However, because no two Etruscan temples or ritual structures found so far, are exactly alike, or even similar, we may be looking for the wrong indicators and drawing the wrong conclusions. An additional problem is created by an overreliance on sources such as the writings of the Roman architect, Vitruvius, to provide all of the answers, rather than acknowledging the complex development of ritual structures in Etruria (see Izzet 2000 for example).

It is, therefore, impossible to investigate comprehensively every Etruscan settlement, cemetery, burial, pot, grave good, temple or votive offering, but this is usually the case in archaeological research. The amount of evidence that is left is very informative. Because I am not considering this a closed data set, the conclusions drawn here can only be helped by more findings. Detailed statistical analysis on these problematic datasets could give a misleading and spurious impression of precision. Instead, the data will be strategically ‘sampled’ to illustrate specific examples of tomb types and grave goods. The data involved are too problematic to assume that quantitative results are the best means of drawing conclusions; on the contrary, the research questions have been designed for a more qualitative investigation.

Other forms of material that will be investigated including: inscriptions, classical literature and examples of iconography, also have their own limitations. Some of these limitations are based on the nature of the data, and some are due to the manner in which they will be used for this project.

The use of inscriptions must be addressed. I am not an epigrapher, and do not want to consider the material in that light. The Etruscan language is not fully understood because it is thought to be a non-Indo-European language, and the majority of the corpus consists of proper names (standard corpora for Etruscan inscriptions are *CIE* and Rix 1991). It is also important to consider how representative the data set is. Most Etruscan inscriptions we have are of a sacred nature, on tombs, sarcophagi, votive offerings or sacred calendars (Pfiffig 1975: 9). Significantly, none of the inscriptions is wholly secular. If secular, political, administrative, or literary writings existed they were not inscribed in stone, ceramics, or metals as the others were (Cornell 1995: 46 ; Wilkins 1996a: 123; Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 94-99). Only a

small number of inscriptions are discussed in this project, not as part of a systematic study of the language, but to highlight the few instances where important social roles are mentioned, or to demonstrate the worship of a particular divinity through the use of votives with dedicatory inscriptions (see Chapter III.C).

Certain pieces of classical literature are also examined or cited, including passages from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Livy and Vitruvius. The particular extracts have been chosen because of their relevance to the discussion of the development of authority. The writings are from a later period, but their descriptions of 'Etruscan order', 'religion', 'temples', etc from Roman and Greek points-of-view are valuable sources of information. These writings, however, must be dissected properly to account for subjectivity, implicit agendas and mistaken second-hand information. It must also be acknowledged that the information is being applied to questions that they did not intend to address originally.

Iconographic items, primarily from imagery, such as architectural decorations, as well as grave goods, votive objects and monuments, are used to discuss the changing representation of statuses. Using iconography as a key to understanding social practices and social organisation also has its limitations. It is difficult to assert that it is possible to reconstruct the symbolic meanings inherent in certain iconographical items, but at least some symbolic meanings can be postulated. Considering the way in which the items were used, where they were located, and where they originally came from, can give significant insights into the individuals who used the items, or were in some way connected to them, as well as to the potential meanings.

D. METHODOLOGY

My project is an investigation into the types of authority present at several Etruscan sites during the Orientalising and Archaic periods (seventh and sixth centuries BC). It will be demonstrated that specific forms of authority were made manifest in the overall development of each settlement, its monumental architecture and the associated terracotta decorations, as well as in grave goods, found in the associated

necropoleis. This approach combines a diachronic perspective with data from multiple contexts at each of the chosen sites from across the region, in an effort to recognise long-term cultural transformations that affect more than one sphere of social life, which is unlikely to be uniform across the region. Appreciating the differences between the sites will allow for the potential unique developments at each of the sites to be acknowledged.

This project utilises an innovative approach to studying the development of authoritative roles, in this case for the Etruscans. Decision making visible in the archaeological record will be examined in terms of both individual and group level action, which has not been done before for the Etruscans. Specifically, decisions related to the expression of forms of authority, be they the iconography of the elite or the reactions of the non-elites, will be seen as equally important to understanding the nature and representation of Etruscan authority. A discussion of how individual and group level action may be investigated and described is found in Chapter II.B.

This project also marks a departure from how the data related to Etruscan social hierarchies and the construction of settlements are usually treated. Previously, investigations into the development of Etruscan society focused on the creation of an Etruscan elite class during the Orientalising period, discussed as being brought about by contact with foreign cultures, and in-turn revolutionising their own. Similarly, investigations into the development of ritual space have often focused on the development of temples in relation to the construction of urban space. My project is a departure from many of the works that belong in either of these categories. In the past, the element of choice has been overlooked as a crucial component to social action for individuals and groups. The changes in the material culture during the Orientalising period are seen here as symptomatic of complex social change already in progress. Instead, here the adoption and adaption of elements of foreign will be studied as an insight into the construction of Etruscan, primarily elite authoritative, ideology. The development of ritual architecture will be examined as not only being related to the physical transformation of ritual space, but also as one of the main keys to understanding the development of authority in the ritual sphere.

Because of the nature of the data, certain types of data will be of more value than others. Data from funerary, settlement and ritual contexts will be integrated as much as possible at each site, but as discussed in the Limitations section (Chapter I.C) there are problems with the availability of settlement and funerary data in particular. On the other hand, data related to ritual activity, especially ritual structures, are well documented; also, although the data obtainable from tombs may not be comprehensive, the potential information to be gleaned is sizable. Because of this much of the data presented in this project comes from the ritual and funerary sphere. From the ritual sphere, abundant data related to ritual architecture, and practices including votive deposits can offer insights into the physical transformations of ritual space, the iconography involved and changes in functions and access. From the funerary sphere, an overwhelming amount of data from grave goods can be seen to be instruments for the expression of elite statuses. The most telling grave goods are personal ornaments, often hand-held objects such as weaponry or staffs of different types, representing potential statuses held in life (see Chapter II.A.5 for a discussion of the difficulties involved). These types of grave goods are crucial because of their relative rarity. Other types of grave goods are numerous, such as pottery, and so do not offer unique differences between burials, for the most part. As already mentioned, pottery cannot be studied comprehensively, and so the number or types of pots present in tombs cannot be used as a measure of relative wealth or importance in economic spheres for the deceased, and so pottery will not be focused on as a key type of evidence. In relation to the purposes of this project, that is, examining the development of different authoritative roles, the types of data that can and will be used here lend themselves to understanding identity in the ritual and funerary spheres, such as sacred and valorous statuses, rather than economic or purely political statuses (as will be discussed in Chapter II.A, particularly section 1). Economic and political statuses will not be concentrated on for two reasons: the nature of the data makes these two spheres more difficult to examine, and it is believed that these roles develop after those related to supernatural and physical force gain importance in many societies (again see Chapter II.A.1, and Chapter VIII).

The development of each of the settlements, in as many areas as possible, is key to investigating the creation of authoritative roles. As a result, both recent and neglected

old excavation reports will be integrated to form a full picture of what is present at each site. Settlements with monumental, ritual architecture from the seventh and sixth century BC will form the basis of the data set for beginning the investigation. Ten sites have been chosen: Acquarossa, Caere (including Montetosto), Castellina del Marangone, Castelnuovo Berardenga, Murlo, Poggio Buco, Punta della Vipera, Tarquinia (including Gravisca), Tuscania and Veii (see Figure IV.1).

The conclusions bring together the intra-site and regional levels of analysis. My contention is that the ideology of the ruling elite developed (and materialised) in relation to the particular types of power structures at work. By unravelling the symbolic meanings behind the data used to express special statuses, we will be able to better understand what forms of authority existed. In particular, I am hoping to clarify whether a secular or sacred form of authority, or a combination of the two, existed. I shall use: the representations of the elites in their burials, the construction and deconstruction of monuments, changes in votive practices, evidence of a relationship between grave good and votive deposition and written evidence of roles and political organisation.

II. THEORETICAL ISSUES

A. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The approach used for this project has been chosen to integrate various types of material that are usually viewed in isolation. Central to this is the idea that “cultures are meaningfully constituted because each material trait is produced in relation to a set of symbolic schemes and general principles of symbolic meaning” (Hodder 1982a: 186). Material culture is, then, created purposefully, as a result of the symbolic and functional meanings particular to a society, group or individual. In this way, material culture can transform, rather than simply reflect, the relationships in other aspects of social life through a framework of beliefs, concepts and attitudes (Hodder 1982a: 207). It is problematic, however, that these objects, images, practices, and so on may possibly express an inversion, disguise or distortion of social reality (Hodder 1982a: 201). By incorporating various types of data which are the results of disparate forms of social action, these misleading processes may be identified, and help create a clearer picture of the social organisation at work. This integrative approach will attempt to interpret the developments and patterns of different types of data in relation to each other, in an attempt to contextualise the symbolic aspects behind their creation.

1. AUTHORITY

It is especially problematic attempting to reconstruct social reality in hierarchical societies, where differentiated statuses exist, determined by the distribution of power, the appearance of which can be manipulated by individuals and groups. To investigate the nature and representation of authority, a discussion of what ‘power’ and ‘authority’ involve must first be introduced. Dennis Wrong defines different types of power and authority in his anthropological study (Wrong 1979). Power can be defined as “the ability to produce intended performances from others” (Wrong 1979: 1), and its different forms vary as to how those performances are extracted. Means such as force, manipulation, persuasion, and authority are often cited as sources of Power (Wrong 1979: 24). However, Authority differs from the others as a ‘command-obedience relationship’(Wrong 1979: 40). This implies that there is an

acknowledged agreement on both sides of the equation that both are behaving in an acceptable way, and may continue for an extended period, rather than being limited to one encounter.

Wrong also goes on to define types of Authority, which are: coercive, inductive, legitimate, competent and personal. *Coercive authority* is based on a convincing threat of force. *Inductive authority* is based on rewards for obedience. *Legitimate authority* is based on voluntary acceptance of the power holder's 'right to command and the subjects' acknowledged obligation to obey'. *Competent authority*, on the other hand, is authority resulting from the expertise of specialised and restricted knowledge or skill. *Personal authority* is acknowledged purely due to one's personal qualities, such as charisma. These terms are, of course, artificial constructions but they make it possible to deconstruct and understand the power base in a social system. Different aspects of authority are often combined, such as coercive and inductive authority, to offer incentives backed by a threat of force (Wrong 1979: 41-60).

In other anthropological sources, forms of Power and Authority are described in different terms, but often express overlapping themes (Russell 1975, Mann 1986). In Michael Mann's view, Power is divided into four types (Mann 1986: 2-26). *Ideological Power* is based on the monopolisation of norms and shared understandings concerning how people should act morally and socially. *Economic Power* is derived through the organisation and distribution of subsistence needs for the group. *Military Power* is based on the organisation of physical defence [and presumably offence]. Lastly, *Political Power* is based on the practicality of centralised, institutionalised and territorial regulation of social relations, i.e. state power.

Bertrand Russell, however, states that there are two main forms of power: traditional and naked (Russell 1975: 27). Priestly and kingly are the main forms of *traditional power*, and exist in even the most 'primitive' societies, sometimes combined by one individual (Russell 1975: 35). *Naked power* is usually militaristic, and is often based on another type of power, such as wealth, technological knowledge and fanaticism (Russell 1975: 28). Russell also describes *economic and revolutionary power*, but

these are partly derivative, and he sees them as changes in a pre-existing power structure (Russell 1975: 82).

These forms of Power and Authority are never found in isolation, but are instead used in combination and necessarily involve interaction between individuals and groups. These terms do not seem wholly perfect for use with the Etruscan evidence from the eighth to sixth centuries BC. Some of the processes described by Mann might be better used with societies which are one step farther down the road of social stratification, in as far as the economic and political forms of power are concerned. Economic power is only potentially wielded in an already hierarchical society (cf. Torelli 1988: 57; Menichetti 2000: 79). This type of power is dependent on trade, ownership of land, unequal distribution of resources and the creation of debt, rather than on even redistribution systems which are usually in place in a non-hierarchical society. An economy based on these competitive measures already has differentiated roles instituted, and can therefore act to reinforce the statuses of the individuals who are trying to maintain authority. The creation of a class of landless individuals, dependent on the social system, probably develops after the development of a social hierarchy originally based on criteria other than that of land ownership. Similarly, political power is a secondary or later development in an already hierarchical society. By definition, it is a result of a complex, centralised means of maintaining authority that has been the result of long-term development. The basis of political power relies on the belief that the system at work must be maintained by a competent individual or individuals, who can oversee the centralised system. Moreover, the use of the term military power, suggesting the ability to amass armies, may not be appropriate for each context, instead a term used to express a range of types of authority based on an individual's demonstration of strength or heroism or the ability to organise large groups for military purposes.

All three models do, however, touch upon a crucial aspect of formative societies. That is, the common factor that many of the earliest special statuses in societies are based on special connections with the divine and sacred rituals. Wrong's competent authority, Mann's ideological power and Russell's priestly power all share the common traits of specialised, restricted knowledge related to interaction with the

divinities and the appropriate actions that the society must take to reflect the desired relationship with those divinities. This role is often seen to be the most important in small-scale, non-hierarchical societies; the skills involved are meant to be unique and therefore only held by special, sometimes 'chosen' individuals. These skills are at least partly innate, regardless of age, and cannot be fully taught to others who do not possess the 'gift', unlike pottery making and other important skills. The holders of special skills then often hold important or authoritative positions.

In addition, the concept of physical strength is indicated by all three scholars to have played a key role. If their terms of coercive authority, military power and naked power are altered slightly, it can be suggested that a common factor of physical strength and bravery are often integral in authoritative roles in formative societies; in this project, the term 'valour' will be used to denote this. The importance of valour is often the result of the significance of recurring events of hunting, protecting the settlement areas and tribal warfare.

To view the discussion of authority from the perspective of social evolutionary models (to be discussed in section B.2), certain types of authority may be expected *a priori* to be present in different 'levels/types' of society. For instance, authority in tribes is usually based on special skills or charismatic qualities. The purpose of these individuals in largely egalitarian, tribal societies usually involves a special connection with the supernatural, including communication with, or appeasement of the deities. 'Chiefdoms' are rather more hierarchical in nature, where a head of the society can be readily recognised. The term 'chiefdom' has sparked much controversy and discussion over the past twenty years (see Earle 1991 for a discussion; Sanders, Marino 1970: 53, 100; Redman 1978; Johnson, Earle 1987: 266-267, 281-283; Wason 1994: 12, 40-47; and section B.2 of this chapter). These individuals' authority is sometimes based on an aspect of economic power, involving issues such as the redistribution of resources. Aspects of military power are also common in chiefdoms, possibly with control over private armies, or the ability to mobilise supporters. Both tribes and chiefdoms are organised according to kinship ties. In early states, the differences are even greater, with the society greatly hierarchical and, consequently, the extent of authority reaching even farther, unrelated to kinship. The greater

demands involved in controlling early states and full states include: large populations leading to actions of appropriation and uneven distribution of land, levying of taxes, creation of codified laws, and the amassing of armies. There is also the issue of slavery: absolute control over individuals profoundly affects the social structure, economy and military. It is all of these processes that depend on the development and strong use of economic, political and military power to a much greater degree than chiefdoms, and on a much more permanent time scale (Johnson, Earle 1987; Redman 1978; Sanders, Marino 1970: 53; Service 1971; Wason 1994: 58-59).

During the period under study, many of these social changes possibly occurred in Etruria, from a largely egalitarian society during the tenth and ninth centuries BC, to centralised states consisting of cities by at least the fifth century BC (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 60-65; Spivey, Stoddart 1990: 39-56; Renfrew 1986: 2; Torelli 2000b: 20-23; Di Gennaro 1982: 105-112). The social transformations that occurred during the eighth to sixth centuries BC are the key to understanding which forms of authority were present in the formative stages of the Etruscan culture and which continued to be implemented into the later periods through time of dramatic change. These transformations should at least be partly apparent in the archaeological record through the development of settlement structures, temples, burial and votive practices. It is essentially the aim here to recognise these transformations at several sites and attempt to glean the reasons behind the changes.

The creation and institutionalisation of authority in a society mark a major change in the dynamics between the members of that society. The impetus behind the development and maintenance of differentiated roles, varies depending on the specific circumstances, of course, but the traits and functions shared by the authoritative individuals at different stages of the development of a society may be separated out for discussion. These can be grouped into four broad categories of individuals who elevate themselves by means of *special skills, valour, economics and politics*. The existence of the first two—special skills and valour—may be possible to recover from the archaeological record, with evidence of individuals being distinguished from the rest of the society by certain characteristic paraphernalia, different monuments and religious practices. For instance, special skills often involve knowledge of the

supernatural, ritual practices, important technologies, etc. The crucial role of an individual with special skills is that of an intermediary between the divine and the secular; this divide places the individual in between the two categories, often resulting in an elevated, authoritative position. In the absence of other types of authoritative roles, the role of special skills is usually the highest authoritative position in the society, but these roles can exist alongside other forms of authority. Along with special skills also come special tools, garments and structures to emphasise the individuals' unique status and authority. Economic and political authority may be integral after the development of other forms of authority, and in the case of Etruscan contexts, may have been secondary following the development of authority based on valour and special skills.

Valour, on the other hand, involves a show of strength, bravery, or capability of violence, either in the sphere of hunting, competitive fighting, or battle (even on a small-scale), at least initially. As this relationship transforms into something more lasting, the notions of hunter, champion, or warrior can evolve into connotations of the heroic. The valorous individual also plays an important role in society, particularly chiefdoms, by offering the means of protection from the earthly elements of wild animals, starvation, and threatening neighbours. This form of authority does not often exist in isolation, but more often with another form of authority. And so, along with valorous authority, often come weapons: offensive, defensive, decorative and ceremonial. It is not uncommon for a considerable part of a society to participate in this ideology, not in a fully authoritative way, but as a means of attaining a slightly higher status. The 'warrior burial' culture that is seen across much of Europe during the Bronze Age indicates an importance placed on strength, heroic deeds and valorous efforts (for example Treherne 1995: esp. 106; 1993). These burials mark the elevated status of the individuals with the inclusion of warrior assemblage grave goods, including helmets, swords, axes, shields, etc.

2. RITUAL

Special skills, as defined above, relate to the presence of ritual in a society. Attempts to define 'ritual' have revealed a number of complex unresolved issues for archaeologists (Brück 1999: 313; see also Insoll 2004: 10). An overwhelming amount

of literature has dealt with the position of ritual in archaeology; this section barely scratches the surface, of course, but is included to give a general idea of how ritual has been used here. For the purposes of this project, a simple description will be adopted. Ritual combines both action and mental activity in both sacred and secular spheres (Insoll 2004: 10). Many of the actions are potentially archaeologically visible, and those dealing with the sacred are of particular importance here, rather than actions of daily routine. A very strict division between sacred and secular is not expected for the Etruscans during this period (for a discussion see Brück 1999: 314). And so, ritual activity dealing with notions of transcending the everyday world to one of the sacred, supernatural or divine, which often involves a social institution of some sort as a means of accomplishing this, will be focused on (Durkheim 1995: 9, 44, 441; Renfrew 1985: 12).

Elements of ritual may be archaeologically visible through architecture with sacred functions (often monumental); a dichotomy of conspicuous public display and hidden exclusive mysteries, sometimes reflected in the architecture; iconography depicting images of devotion to the sacred, as well as an emphasis on the repetition of symbols; architecture, facilities and equipment, including altars, which serve as attention-focusing devices; cult images; remains of sacrifices; votive offerings; iconographic symbols that relate to powerful actions in other social spheres, such as funerary rituals (Renfrew 1985: 19). An individual's ability to control or maintain any of these elements entails a degree of authority placing him or her in an elevated position. To understand the development of statuses involved in (sacred) ritual authority, the context of ritual action must be investigated, which entails primarily the architecture, iconography, remains of equipment and other facilities, including votive deposits. Changes in the context of ritual may relate very directly to changes in extent or type control over ritual action.

3. IDEOLOGY

Both authoritative and non-authoritative roles develop as a necessary part of hierarchical social structures. According to Giddens, all power relations are reciprocal, and manifest autonomy and dependence in both directions (1979: 149). Agency, then, is continually reproduced in daily actions and definite practices

(Giddens 1979: 149). The inseparable relationship between agency and power is negotiated through the use of ideology to define or alter the agents' ability to control their own environment and affect their relations with others. A strict definition of ideology is difficult to arrive at, but for my purposes, some of Parker Pearson's ideas will be used here (Parker Pearson 1982). Ideology can be a "system of beliefs through which the perceived world of appearances is interpreted as a concrete and objectified reality"(Parker Pearson 1982: 100). This is accomplished and expressed through 'systems of signification', both verbal and non-verbal. Ideology consists of a 'pure ideographic system', in which the signifier becomes the actual signified concept (Parker Pearson 1982: 100, citing Barthes 1973: 127). In a sense, a related concept, word and object become fused together inseparably as part of ideology.

Ideology is a means for dominant groups or classes to make their own sectional interests appear to others as universal ones, according to Giddens (1979: 6). In other words, ideology is potentially used by all groups or individuals, but archaeologically, the ideology of the elites is more easily recoverable. Ideology, then, can be used as a tool by one group to assert its right to dominance over the rest of the society by legitimating or naturalising their interests. One of the main interests usually concerns maintaining the existing order of domination, which often involves an asymmetrical distribution of resources (Giddens 1979: 190). I am going to argue that Etruscan elites, particularly the authoritative individuals, created their own 'concrete and objectified reality' to bolster their own positions, through the use of several means, including: iconography, special dress, burials and monuments.

Archaeologically, ideology is traceable through its materialisation (De Marrais, et al. 1996). According to De Marrais et al., these "concrete manifestations" are the result of several aspects of social actions including: ceremonial events, symbolic objects and icons, public monuments and landscapes and writing systems. Ceremonies could include events such as feasts and rituals. Symbolic objects could include ritual equipment, mural paintings, icons or emblems of all sorts. Public monuments and landscapes could include mounds, tombs, ceremonial areas, large structures for communal use and defensive structures. Writing systems can be involved in administrative, judicial, literary and onomastic purposes. These categories actually

overlap, however, with inscriptions on monuments, ceremonies enacted for the building of monuments or the re-telling of written stories. (De Marrais, et. al. 1996: 17-19).

But what is explicitly omitted from this model (De Marrais, et al. 1996), is the use of iconography as an ideological tool across all of these categories. The existence, use and organisation of ceremonies, objects, monuments, and writing systems involve an overlapping use of iconography, which reinforces the legitimacy of the authoritative individuals involved in these areas of social activity. The physical expressions of ideology actively transform and alter the appearance of individuals through clothing (Earle 1990), emblems and icons (Marcus 1976), and the appearance of the landscape with monuments of political, funerary and religious forms (Trigger 1990); they also create new social divisions between groups by altering the means of communication through writing systems which restrict knowledge to an elite few (Stoddart and Whitley 1988). The symbolic meanings of the objects and practices are partially recoverable as well, by considering the context of the objects, the intrinsic value of the materials used, their rarity or commonality, their temporal longevity, and the ways in which their use and form transformed over time (Hodder 1987: 5-10).

In an interesting, possible parallel to the Etruscan situation, Ronald Spores sees the role of ideology as integral to the development of social stratification for the Mixtec (Spores 1983). According to Spores, the first special status to develop in the Mixtec culture was the religious specialist, who began with control over sacred, and gradually many secular, activities (Spores 1983: 232-235). The religious specialists were able to direct and control the construction of ceremonial complexes and the collection of tribute for cult activities, as well as for distribution among the rising elite classes. Eventually, the accumulated wealth and resources in the hands of a few led to the transformation of ritual power and authority into political power and authority. This was augmented by the construction of mythologies emphasising elite connections with important ancestors, real and fictive. Later changes in priestly and political roles related to further differentiations can be seen in changes in the architecture, with separate dwelling structures being built apart from the ceremonial structures, according to Spores.

While Spores' work is very interesting, and may make a useful comparison with the Etruscans, he does not show how specific examples of ideology, such as myths, were used in the defining of authoritative roles. He does not clearly demonstrate that it is the religious specialists working alone at the top of this social hierarchy. It would be interesting to note how changes in ideology coincide with changes in the priestly and political roles, as well as in architecture. In addition, Spores largely neglects other types of data that may help illuminate why social stratification developed the way it did, such as changes in funerary and ritual practices. His real aim is to associate the rise of social stratification with the creation of the state as a direct progression.

Interestingly, Takeshi Inomata discusses the relationship between ideology and iconography as being directly related to social hierarchy (Inomata 2001). He asserts that power relations are tied to ideology because craft specialisation can be controlled by elites to distinguish themselves, due to limited and privileged knowledge related to the encoded symbols held within the iconography (Inomata 2001: 321-323). Ideology, Inomata stresses, is an important means of interaction between people consciously acting and reacting to make sense of the world around them (Inomata 2001: 323; Threborn 1980: 2; Gardiner 1992: 65; McGuire 1992: 140-141). Because of this, ideology allows for people to accept their roles and positions in a society, according to Inomata (Inomata 2001: 324; McGuire 1992: 43). In slight contrast, Louis Althusser argues that ideologies 'are neither simple causes nor results of particular social relations, but the two are inseparable' (Inomata citing Althusser 1971).

I would qualify aspects of Inomata's work by suggesting that ideology is often developed to shape the roles of the elites, as well as attempting to legitimate and normalise their roles in contrast to the rest of the society. In addition, it should be noted that many of the investigations into ideology are heavily Marxist. The emphasis on the aristocratic or elite classes as using ideology as a means of control over the masses is too simplistic, attached to the idea of 'false consciousness' (Giddens 1979; attributed to Engels 1893). Ideology does not trickle down through the classes; instead it should be seen as a multi-sourced, multi-directional

phenomenon. All groups and individuals take part in the creation and transformation of ideologies. For the purposes of archaeology, however, the ideology experienced by the elites is often more visible and recoverable. In relation to this project, the earliest phases are not characterised by formal classes of society, and yet ideology still plays an important part in the formation of special roles in the developing Etruscan cultures. Attempting to understand the formation of ideology behind the development of specific roles for special skills and valour is necessary for understanding how these forms of authority were created and functioned. The ideology held within burial practices, monuments, icons and iconography must be examined in order to approach the matter.

4. ICONOGRAPHY

Iconography, as already mentioned, is often intimately connected with ideology, and can function as a medium for it. Iconography, or “writing in images” literally, can communicate a wide variety of messages (Moore 1977: 18). One powerful function, however, is to express the desires, opinions or beliefs of the elites, in both private and public contexts. Elites, including Etruscan elites, utilised iconography as a means of representing themselves, through their lifestyles, duties and responsibilities, as well as depicting the world around them, with scenes of animals, battles and mythical figures, including gods. These images were integrated into architectural decorations, such as relief plaques and painted scenes, on houses, temples, palace-like structures and tombs, as well as on objects, such as vases, mirrors, furniture and statuary in both funerary and everyday contexts. The theme, placement and context related to the audience, function and intent of the iconography.

The work of Erwin Panofsky on the development of art history has set the scene for the analysis of iconography (1939, 1955). His methods of viewing and interpreting images have been the basis of much research related to iconography. According to Panofsky, iconography concerns itself with the subject matter or meaning of works of art, as opposed to form. It relies on the description and classification of images through familiarity with themes, such as artistic motifs and allegories. Iconology, as proposed by Panofsky, on the other hand, deals with the ‘discovery and interpretation of “symbolic” values’. Within iconology, an object is seen as a product of an artist, as

well as, a particular context, including historical processes, that necessarily affect its 'intrinsic' meaning (Panofsky 1939: 7-16).

Others, such as, Mannheim (1971), Bourdieu (1967) and Davis (1989) offer different perspectives on interpreting iconography. Karl Mannheim's development of the concept *Weltanschauung* within a sociological framework greatly affected the work of Panofsky. Mannheim insists that beyond the style and subject matter of an object gaps exist in the understanding of a greater 'whole' of the work surrounding the artist's background, the 'whole' of the culture, as well as, the *Weltanschauung* of an epoch (in Wolff 1971: 11). Whitney Davis uses a case study of dynastic Egyptian art to examine the construction of iconography through a canonisation of artistic scenes and elements (1989: 2, 59ff). Davis states that stylistic analysis of iconographies suggests that artistic procedures are developed for the distinctive representation of separate themes within a tradition. Then, with the help of historical analysis to identify the themes, syntactic analysis to reveal the internally referenced elements of the image, and semantic analysis to identify how definition, classification and valuation of experience are articulated through representation, it may be possible to reconstruct the original categories, according to Davis. Once a canon of iconography has been established, the rules of interpretation have become fixed. Knowledge of this system was the basis of interpretation and understanding for the original viewer. Egyptian iconography became largely invariant because the "artists and patrons chose to depend upon such rules", with core motifs and elements being occasionally varied, and yet still maintaining its canon. These motifs could also be translated into different types of contexts and still remain intelligible to the viewer, according to Davis (Davis 1989: 63-64, 92-93).

It is interesting to note the parallels with the case of Archaic Etruria. The settlements were not unified formally like Egypt, but one can see the dialectic of iconographies forming during this period. Scenes such as those depicted in the frieze plaques show a concern with expressing similar messages across the region. In particular, the motifs illustrating elite lifestyles and symbols indicating specific authoritative statuses were borrowed from other artistic canons; however, certain elements were deliberately varied to suit the needs of different circumstances. Also, many of the

iconographic elements were used in both ritual and funerary contexts, indicating that meanings behind them were clear despite different surroundings.

Archaeological research into iconography should necessarily employ this 'historical' level of investigation, that is, using a multi-contextual analysis to consider an item as iconography, the circumstances of its creation and its place in the original social context. Joyce Marcus, for instance, does just that in her examination of the roles of ideology and iconography in the Classic Maya lowlands (1976). According to Marcus, many changes are evident in 'Cycle 9' of the culture, seen in a standardised symbol system on monuments and an elaborated state art style (Marcus 1976: 191). She identifies a 'Period of Uniformity', rather than one of conquest, with four regional capitals becoming important centres, with their own 'glyphs' or symbols, which developed alliances of equal rank (Marcus 1976: 191-192). It is the co-adoption of a standardised lunar calendar and the homogeneity of the style and iconography of the monuments at these sites, however, that indicate interaction on equal levels for these centres. The iconography, particularly the glyphs, was used as a means of settlement identification and allowed for communication between them, which importantly clarified the rank of all the settlements in the region, such as one of equality between the large centres with unique emblems, or one of dependence for the smaller sites without emblems on the large centres (Marcus 1976: 44-45).

Marcus' work is very insightful; her case study clearly shows the use of iconography as an important tool for the development of a region. She concentrates on the development of 'settlement hierarchies' and 'state formation'; however, some of the broader themes are directly relevant to my project. The use of iconography by the authoritative members of a society in an attempt to define their control over places, resources or practices is a crucial topic. Unfortunately, Marcus is more concerned with this on a regional level, rather than concentrating on the intra-site dynamics that may have affected the iconography, both of which may be crucial.

Paul Zanker (1988) discusses the power of images during the Late Roman Republic and the reign of Augustus. He examines the impact of the creation of a new political entity, the alteration of society, and the development of a new system of visual

communication (Zanker 1988: 3). Zanker begins by discussing the Hellenisation of the human figure during the late Republic. During this period, rivalry between aristocrats and politicians was manifested in contradictory imagery characterised by realistic faces paired with superhuman, heroic bodies (Zanker 1988: 8). Ostentatious tomb monuments also became a means of engaging in individual rivalry and insecurity through self-aggrandisement (Zanker 1988: 15). Then, while Octavian struggled for the supremacy of Rome, he turned to architecture and art to glorify himself, initially through the construction of the Temple of Apollo and the Mausoleum (Zanker 1988: 77).

After the battle of Actium, however, all imagery of power related to one person, the Emperor (Zanker 1988: 85). According to Zanker, the sudden change in the composition of power was reflected in new forms of imagery to meet these changing needs. The early portrait of Caesar Augustus, relying on the Classical canon, marked a turning point from Late Republican sculpture with its symmetric, smooth face, devoid of individualised personality. Nude figures were then replaced with togate images. Augustus also embarked on an impressive architectural programme with the building of many lavish temples as a statement of his power and the power of the Roman Empire. According to Zanker, the new visual language was the result of renewed use of Archaic and Classical forms to emphasise peace and virtuous rule. The Classical elements, in particular, allowed for a 'superculture' to be created by combining Greek aesthetics with Roman propriety. Natural elements in sculpture, such as vines, were used to suggest that this new age was a 'paradise on earth'. Vergil's Aeneid created a national myth to unify Rome and justify Augustus's rule. (Zanker 1988: 98-108, 239-240).

Zanker states that changes in the political structure, in particular, Augustus' rise to power, were accompanied by decisive changes in all forms of art and architecture, as well as the entire system of visual communication. In fact, "the new forms of artistic and visual expression had arisen in the wake of fundamental political change", according to Zanker (Zanker 1988: 335). For him, these changes naturally coincided; as a new political system was created, new ways were necessarily demanded to express the power and duties it entailed in turn the resulting images (including objects

and structures) impacted the entire society. Many of the new forms relied on a reinterpretation of an older, foreign visual language used to mark a strong contrast with the preceding political atmosphere.

Zanker's work is an insightful way of integrating the political and social spheres of a society through the use of iconography. Changes in the political sphere necessarily affect other aspects of life, either directly through the use of authority or, indirectly, through the perception of dramatic change. The main elements of iconography from an old political system can no longer be used effectively when the ideas and language behind them have become obsolete. New elements of iconography can be employed to express and clarify the changes in the political sphere through images of the leader(s) acting out new roles (such as Augustus taking up priestly roles), or through monuments and architecture expressing control over labour, physical domination of the landscape and the presence of new structures for special activities or people. In the case of temple construction, a direct link between the ruler and a divinity is made concrete (see Zanker 1988: 108). As a result, changes in iconography in art and architecture can be used as a means of understanding changes in political and social spheres.

Timothy Earle (1990) takes the relationship of political change and iconography in a different direction, with an emphasis on coercion. He states that leaders used iconography as a means of legitimising systems of inequality and control (Earle 1990: 73). Earle argues that changes in style and iconography aid in organising society by materially marking difference, particularly during the development of social stratification and "complex chiefdoms" (Earle 1990: 73). New forms of style are created within an iconographic system to elevate the ruling elite, according to Earle, to manipulate knowledge and access to a power based on economic control (Earle 1990: 81).

Earle focuses on the manipulated appearance of "chiefs" in the Hawaiian and Olmec cultures. While their physical appearances were augmented by types of clothing, this seems to be a limited view of how iconography can affect the construction of authoritative roles. Changes in iconography are not of course limited to personal

appearance, but it is one example that shows that iconography used to elevate one's status does not rely solely on economic considerations. The richness or rarity of the materials used in the iconography is not the sole key to creating an elevated status; the symbologies within an iconographic system are encoded within contexts that relate to traditions, myths and many other issues.¹ A wider context must be incorporated to appreciate the other factors present in the creation, use and effects of a new iconographic system.

For this project, investigating iconography is necessary to broach the development of authority for the Etruscans. The iconography related to the first examples of monumental architecture across Etruria illustrates at least some of the issues being communicated by the individuals associated with the structures. The monumental structures themselves, along with the frieze plaques, statues, etc. which augmented them, express ideas concerning the function of the structures, and the roles of the connected individuals. The meanings inherent in these examples of iconography will also be compared with iconography present in the other spheres of social life, predominately the funerary sphere. Some of the earliest forms of iconography will be shown to relate to the creation of authoritative roles, by clarifying, justifying and celebrating their existence. Iconography particularly related to the depiction of special skills and valour will be seen to be a major component of Etruscan iconography (see also Chapter I.D for a discussion of the methodology involved).

5. ELITES AND POWER THROUGH MONUMENTAL ARCHITECTURE

As briefly mentioned above, monumental architecture is an element of ideology (De Marrais, et al. 1996: 18). Monumental architecture is defined as structures built to a scale and level of elaboration that exceeds the requirements of any practical functions which a building is intended to perform, usually involving a plan on a large scale, a high degree of engineering and artistic skills and organisation of labour and resources

¹ A feather cap is not 'just' a feather cap; what makes one special and another not, relies not just on the speciality of colourful feathers from rare birds for its importance, other factors such as ideas associated with the bird itself in folklore, or the special status of creatures that fly through the heavens, or that labourers with skills made the hat, affect the perception of one who wears a feather cap.

(Trigger 1990: 119). Its presence dramatically transforms the landscape in an enduring way, both visually and spatially. The structures themselves, such as ceremonial buildings, tombs and walls, as well as iconographic elements associated with the structures, can act as powerful media for expressing the types of authority present. The earliest forms of monumental architecture in any given society tend to be of a ritual, palatial or funerary nature, indicating their intimate relationship with elites. It is only later that structures of a more public nature begin, such as baths and theatres (Trigger 1990: 121).

Physically, monumental architecture embodies the ability of powerful individuals to oversee the organisation of resources, labour and artisans in order to create something on a grand scale. This is possible through elites who control surplus goods and labour to be involved in non-utilitarian construction projects. In contrast to practical endeavours in a society, which typically rely on efficiency and minimal expenditure of resources and energy, monumental architecture explicitly demonstrates that the human and natural resources of the society extend beyond the bare minimum. This, in effect, symbolises the authority and control over the sources of energy expended during the construction. “The ability to expend energy, especially in the form of other people’s labour, in non-utilitarian ways, is the most basic and universally understood symbol of power” (Trigger 1990: 125).

Beyond their construction, forms of monumental architecture continue to communicate ideology. Associations with elites, ritual ceremonies (funerary or non-funerary), political activities and redistribution of resources add to the elevated position of monumental architecture within and between societies. Monumental architecture can have a divisory role between elites and non-elites within a society, and can conversely have a cohesive role to bond society together in a shared ideology (Trigger 1990: 125-126; Wilson 1988: 122). Architecture is thought to give a precise spatial definition to social structure. There is a direct relationship between monumental architecture and ideology. More specifically, architecture related to different spheres of social life demonstrates changes in authority related to those spheres. Increased expenditure in ritual architecture indicates an increase in ritual authority, not only in the ability to oversee the construction, but often to restrict

access to certain ritual practices and to create separations, physical and symbolic, between the authoritative individuals and the rest (Kolb 1994: 521-532).

A predominance of certain types of buildings at any one period for a society is argued to illuminate the social structures responsible for their creation. According to Trigger, the emphasis on temples during the early stages of many cultures, including Mesopotamia, Mesoamerica and Peru, may show an effort on the part of the elites to concretise a hierarchy of a ritual nature that was not yet centralised. He adds that the temples, in these cases, symbolised the collective power of the upper class (Trigger 1990: 128). Rather than assuming that these ritual structures were built in association with each other and their attached elites as a collective, the monumental architecture may have served as a means of competing for control, as was suggested by the study of pre-contact Hawai'i by Kolb (1994: 532). Trigger does qualify his assertions by stating that the monumental architecture is not necessarily a direct reflection of social reality. Instead, the wider context of data must be considered to understand the surrounding social circumstances that relate to their construction, and that palaces, temples and monumental tombs are some of the potential expressions of shifting power (Trigger 1990: 128; see Wilson 1988 for a discussion focusing on the importance of monumental burial).

6. SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL THROUGH BURIAL EVIDENCE

Many works have dealt with the difficulties involved in reconstructing societies through funerary material alone (For example, Parker Pearson 1982; Hodder 1982a; Morris 1987, 1992; Renfrew 1974; Cannon 1989; Treherne 1995).

The expressive redundancy model proposed by Aubrey Cannon (1989) is problematic. Cannon shares A. L. Kroeber's view that "mortuary patterns are in a class with fashions, dress, luxuries and etiquette" (Cannon 1989: 437; citing Kroeber 1927: 314). Consequently, changes in mortuary practices are the result of "competitive mortuary expression". Cannon defines three stages of this. First, increases in affluence, socio-economic instability and status uncertainty result in the initial elaboration of mortuary practices. Second, competitive representation of status

and aspirations of higher status eventually reaches a climax of elaborate funerary display. Third, a decline in mortuary expression follows until the previous forms of expression are forbidden. Cannon believes these patterns are “independent of changes in the social structure and largely independent from changes in religious belief or degree of emotional concern for the dead” (Cannon 1989: 438). He goes on to say that mortuary practices change because they are outlets of social expression, the meanings of which are derived from contrast with the surrounding mortuary practices found in the same context. (Cannon 1989: 437-446).

There are several problems with Cannon’s model. The analogy of comparing mortuary patterns with changing fashions is inappropriate. There are also numerous examples of non-competitive burial forms, including group burials from the Neolithic. The cyclical pattern of ostentation and restraint in mortuary practices does occur in many cultures; however, there are many factors involved that Cannon is reluctant to accept. If mortuary practices are largely expressions of ‘good taste’ and gain meaning through contrast with past and present forms, then a huge variety in forms of burials and mortuary practices could possibly result, rather than just fluctuations in expenditure. Mortuary practices, I would argue, *are* directly tied to religious beliefs, political and social structures. Consequently, when competitive expression is occurring, it is possible that changes, even cyclical changes, in these related spheres are also occurring. I agree that these changes do not necessarily reflect changing emotional attitudes towards the dead, but this is a separate issue from what religious beliefs and social norms dictate are appropriate burial practices. Investigating changes in mortuary practices in isolation from other factors misses the wider picture. Brad Bartel succinctly points out that Cannon does not question whether the restraint in funerary expenditure is “offset by consumption in a different sphere” (Cannon 1989: 448). Cannon’s three case studies expose the faults of his own argument. The study of Victorian England neglects to mention that this was also a time of religious redefinition for Catholics and Protestants in the country, when the attitudes of the Catholic Church and the Church of England towards funerary rites were in the process of changing, not to mention parallel changes in the class structure. In the historic Northeast Iroquois example, Cannon admits that the arrival of Catholic missionaries might have had an effect on these matters, but denies that it could have

made a dramatic effect on religious beliefs and burial practices. The Dark Age to Classical Greek example does not account for the parallel changes in religious practices involving an explosion in votive offerings made at sanctuaries (Morris 1992:190). Activities in the funerary sphere could have an independent dynamic in certain cases, but Cannon overstates his point.

Morris (1992) develops a good discussion concerning the context of burials and grave goods. For Morris, the context is very much a part of the social structure, and that “the analysis of burials is analysis of symbolic action” (Morris 1992:1). He defines social structure as a set of internalised but constantly renegotiated roles and rules (Morris 1992: 3-9). A funeral, like any other ritual, involves symbols that reiterate the social structure, which also brings meaning to the rituals involved in daily life (Morris 1992: 10). Morris quotes Hodder’s statements referring to burial ritual as active and meaningfully constructed by part or all of a social group, and that ‘In death people often become what they have not been in life’ (Hodder 1982:141,146). This reflects the idea that burial practices are a forum for renegotiating and possibly dramatically affecting the social structure.

Because of this interconnection with the social structure, changes in the burial forms and grave goods can explain much, but only if the context and the meaning of the ceremonies in which they were created are understood (Morris 1992: 108). Times of drastic changes in the archaeological record are equated with times of stress as a result of intensified competition (Morris 1992: 28, citing Hodder 1979, 1982). As a result, increased pressure on groups forces them to become more symbolically different from each other (Morris 1992: 28,146). Changes in lavishness of burials in particular places over long periods of time are investigated by Morris as an indication of social groups attempting to define and redefine themselves through mortuary practices, but also in conjunction with other changes in the social structure. Morris asserts that Cannon’s expressive redundancy model of mortuary practices is a problematic, but useful tool, for examining the changes and trends in burials in a society. The idea of expressive redundancy is based on the idea of cyclical mortuary practices, with the burials of the wealthiest classes of a society being characterised by a high amount of expenditure, which quickly declines as less-wealthy classes increase

their funerary expenditure, and the cycle of imitation continues (Morris 1992: 28, 146). The necessity to change is seen as a result of the inability to impress other social groups or distinguish one from the other if they all share the same mortuary practices. Morris, however, hints that it is probably more than a cycle of display and restraint (1992: 149). He suggests that Renfrew's model, which related to the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age, has been misapplied to the Iron Age, referring to group oriented social structures having unpretentious graves and important public monuments, while individualising social structures have lavish tombs and modest communal monuments (Morris 1992; citing Renfrew 1974: 74-85).

Morris cites the example of burial change in Greece from the late eighth century to the early seventh century, which could be viewed very differently depending on the model that is applied. In some areas of Greece at the end of the eighth century, grave goods and markers show an increase in expenditure, which quickly declines again until a high degree of restraint in expenditure is seen (Morris 1992: 149). The changes would seem very clear cut from Cannon or Renfrew's models; however, Morris tries to examine the changes in a wider context. The changes in burial practices also coincide with changes in religious practices; the decline in funerary expenditure was accompanied by an increase in sanctuary activity, with the construction of temples and deposition of votive offerings (Morris 1992: 149; Snodgrass 1980: 52-55).

The wide perspective that Morris keeps, linking different spheres of social activity, is crucial because the practices involved in one aspect of social life are never carried out in isolation. As Morris suggests, the surrounding context involving other elements from a social structure is necessary for understanding the whole. This type of framework has been applied to Etruscan societies for my project. The relationships at many of the Etruscan sites in question, between expenditure on temples and tombs, is an interesting one during the seventh, and particularly the sixth centuries BC.

In contrast, Paul Treherne (1995) utilises burial evidence to investigate cultural attitudes towards the body as an aspect of social change. He examined the

development of warrior graves in Bronze-Age Western and Northern Europe in terms other than simply the result of ideology. He believes the development is really due to changing views of the human body during this period, mainly the creation of ideal 'masculine beauty' (Treherne 1995: 106). He states that the emergent warrior elite "marked the growth of new understandings of personhood – specifically male self-identity – rooted in both social practices and cultural representations" (Treherne 1995: 106). He then argues that the representation of this new social group was necessarily expressed in new and specific mortuary practices. Treherne goes on to discuss the general archaeological literature that has explained these phenomena in the past. The general emphasis on the communal group, which is attested in many Neolithic cultures, gradually gave way to one emphasising a 'differentiated warrior ideology', which 'sought to legitimate social differentiation not by hiding it but by representing it as natural and immutable through the use of material culture in the form of prestige items and ritual symbols which constantly reiterated the message' (Treherne 1995: 109; 1993). The prestige items were a result of elite interaction over long distances to acquire special objects possible of expressing rank and creating new social power (Treherne 1995: 107; Shennan 1986; Champion et al. 1984). Treherne, however, argues that there are problems with these arguments. First, these concepts of ideology are flawed because they are so preoccupied with the idea of materialist means of legitimisation, and that this is too divorced from social reality (Treherne 1995:115). Also, these views are too general to understand the motivations behind the actions, and often assumes that mortuary practices are necessarily elaborated for 'social aggrandisement' (Parker Pearson 1982, 1984). Treherne rightly points out that these do not answer why weaponry and toiletry articles are used in particular (Treherne 1995: 116). These views do not discern the contextual meanings of prestige goods and the practices in which they were used. Treherne believes that weaponry and toiletry articles become a special feature in Bronze Age burials because of changing views of the human body and its beauty. He states that the body and the surrounding grave goods are involved in a signification system to impart a final image of the deceased for the onlookers (Treherne 1995: 120). The toiletry articles, in particular, express the ideology involved in the new *life style* of the warrior elite, which consists of different attitudes and practices involving the body (Treherne 1995: 125).

I agree with Treherne that it is necessary to investigate the context of changes in burial practices and grave goods, which has often been neglected in the past. This case study is particularly appropriate here because of the general insistence of relying on terms such as 'warrior' and 'prince' to describe elite Etruscan burials (see Chapter I). Elite Etruscan burials provide an immense insight into aspects of the ideology; however, the symbols used within them should not be viewed simplistically, as Treherne asserts. Items, such as a sword, do not always equal a warrior, nor does a mirror always equal a woman (Spivey 1991: 55-62; Izzet 1998: 225). The messages expressed through the ideology and iconography of burials is complex and must be related back to the other spheres of social life.

There are a few problems with Treherne's arguments when looked at in relation to Etruscan evidence. If a wider definition of ideology were used, these changes in burial practices could still be seen as an ideological shift. I do not think Treherne actually concludes why it is a *warrior* elite that emerges, rather than another type of image that could equally express beauty in its burials. The idea of beauty being the key factor is not totally persuasive. It could possibly be related to a wider expression of important roles, involving factors in addition to beauty. After all, many of these types of graves in Etruria also include cooking ware, thrones, chariots and other items. It is not necessarily masculine beauty being emphasised either, with reference to the female graves in Etruria, that possibly date to the end of the Bronze Age/ Early Iron Age. Desires other than an emphasis on the human body and beauty are possibly being stressed in the Bronze Age/ Early Iron Age burials in Etruria because they are largely cremation burials. It is interesting; however, that concepts of beauty and valour (as I would describe it) seem inextricably associated during this period.

There are several issues involved in using funerary evidence while trying to reconstruct other missing elements of the social structures; these, and others, will have to be considered. Burial evidence must be viewed as the result of symbolic action (Morris 1992: 1), which needs to be considered within the context of funerary practices, and developments at the settlement. Funerary contexts are intimately related to religious, political and social spheres, and should not be neglected due to

problems with poor statistical data, grave robbing, etc. In fact, funerary data can be used as an important insight into the construction of identities (d'Agostino 1989: 8-10). Identifying specific tombs as those of authoritative individuals with specific roles is difficult in most cases; many tombs, however, do illustrate aspects of the ideology and iconography present. The main strategy used here to overcome misleading data, is to incorporate as much data as possible from other spheres of social life.

B. SOCIAL EVOLUTION AND AGENCY THEORY

1. INTRODUCTION

Understanding how a culture develops, including that of the Etruscans, involves a complex tangle of issues. I will, first, briefly describe the current state of affairs concerning the analysis of social development in archaeology; then, I will describe the background to these issues later in this section. The debate behind the use of social evolutionary models has been a long one. What began as a useful tool for discussing different types of societies became considered by many to be a very limiting framework with which to view complicated, dynamic sets of ideas and changes. The problems of creating artificial divisions to separate types and levels of social organisation are difficult to resolve, as well as the issue of how universally these frameworks can be applied across time and space. Post-processual approaches have attempted to examine social change by focusing on the actions of individual agents in social practices, in order to avoid the deterministic and over-generalising pitfalls of social evolutionary models. This has also been argued to be too narrow in focus, negating the ability of useful cross-cultural comparisons.

These problems are real ones; however, this project will not attempt to recognise finite transitions in the social organisations present, such as tribes to chiefdoms to states. The main investigation pertains to the related, although somewhat separate, issue of the authoritative structures at work at individual sites, and how they compare and contrast. That being said, social evolutionary models and agency theory have created oppositional means of investigating long-term change, cultural developments and symbolic meanings. The values and problems of both approaches must be

acknowledged while designing the methodology for this, or any, project relating to social development in any sense.

2. BACKGROUND TO SOCIAL EVOLUTIONARY MODELS

Elman Service developed a basic classification of societies, based on the earlier anthropological works of L.H. Morgan, E.B. Tylor and L.A. White, which divided human groups by size, social, economic and religious organisation, settlement pattern and architecture. The main types from simplest to most complex were termed band, tribe or segmentary society, chiefdom and state (Service 1971, 1975). For Service, bands consisted of a few, related nuclear families who foraged wild food. Tribes were characterised by new economic strategies, with greater specialization in the function and integration of groups, consisting of larger kinship groups. Chiefdoms were contained centres that organised the economic, social and religious activities (Service 1971: 98-133). States bear similarities to chiefdoms, but are distinguished from the other forms of organisation by the presence of institutionalised law and government, based on the potential use of force, and the power of a central authority (Service 1975: 15). The laws are created and maintained apart from familistic statuses. Service was really interested in the mechanisms behind socio-political organisations, including how changes regarding the economy affected the structuring of the other facets of society, and the institutionalisation of power. He also questioned the character of the leadership involved in early states. If, as others suggested, chiefdoms were characterised by theocracy and states were characterised by secular leadership, Service argued that the transition could be the result of priest-kings delegating authority to others over military, economic and legal matters, or the result of the priest-king's inability to rule during highly competitive and warlike periods (op cit: 275).

Morton Fried, on the other hand, devised his own scheme, dividing societies by the absence or use of different means of acquiring high status, prestige and legitimacy (Fried 1967: 26). This is built around the concept of the individual and the ability to alter or acquire status levels. He argued that the term 'tribe' was very problematic. Instead, Fried used the terms: egalitarian, rank, stratified and the state. In his

egalitarian societies, positions of prestige were held by as many persons in any given age-sex grade as possible. This situation changes in rank societies, in which fewer positions of valued status are possible to attain and redistribution is organised through a finite society. In stratified societies, fundamental inequalities are evident, and status differences are based on economic differences. States consist of a collection of specialised institutions and agencies that maintain stratification and differential access to resources (Fried 1967: 235). The models of Service and Fried were used widely; however, they came under attack because of inherent assumptions including determinacy and strict expectations of little variability in any of the characteristics.

One of the central problematic features of the social evolutionary models has been the definition of 'chiefdoms'. The characteristics used to define chiefdoms can vary widely, dramatically affecting conclusions. Several scholars view a developing economy as the main factor in identifying chiefdoms, or types of chiefdoms. For them, control over production and/or redistribution from a centre of food and goods is the key to transforming a culture from a semi-egalitarian system to one with a sustainable hierarchy.

Kristian Kristiansen argued that the problems involved in defining 'chiefdoms' could be resolved by investigating the organisation of production in chiefdom societies, but that the variables involved in the types of organisation must be examined in reference to cultural meaning and material functions within the specific societies. Further to this, Kristiansen adds that chiefdoms are a type of tribal society, rather than a stage between tribes and states, and that it is the economic obligations that result in new power relations (Kristiansen 1991: 17,18).

Similarly, Timothy Earle confronted the problems of investigating chiefdoms as a distinct category, although numerous variations potentially exist. He attempts to express the differing views on the problems that arose during the seminar in 1988, 'Chiefdoms: their evolutionary significance' (1991a). Earle recognises three levels of variability in chiefdoms, including: the scale of development from simple to complex, the basis of finance being either staple or wealth motivated and the structures being either group oriented or individualising. Earle argues that a 'power differential'

results from control over labour through control over subsistence. 'Real economic power' is seen as the core basis for control because of its potential to extend over several generations, thereby lending stability to the polity (Earle 1991b: 98). This control must be maintained for a stable political system, partly by actively excluding others from access to control over subsistence, as well as from access to the supernatural. In this way, Earle argues that ideology related to cosmology is necessary to maintaining control over labour and production (Earle 1991a: 9, citing Kristiansen from the seminar). The use of ideology lends legitimacy to the power structure. The highly competitive nature of chiefdoms, for Earle, means that the leadership of chiefdoms must be flexible enough to integrate more than one power base to cover compliance and refusal costs, which potentially threaten the cohesion of the group (Earle 1991a: 13; Earle 1978: 193).

Norman Yoffee finds fault with evolutionary and neo-evolutionary models from a different perspective, particularly the transition between the chiefdoms and states (1993). He argues that the pace of social change is often mistaken as gradual, when it is actually transformational and punctuational (Yoffee 1993: 62; cf. Spencer 1987: 221). Yoffee proposes that the difference between non-states and states is an important one. The beginning of state formation is marked by new administrative technologies and administrative facilities, which for the first time do not relate to kinship systems, and bring about new socio-economic and governmental roles. According to Yoffee, the dimensions of power are the key towards developing a new social evolutionary theory. In addition, he argues that the simultaneous development of the three types of power (i.e. economic, societal, including ideological, and political), is necessary for state emergence (Yoffee 1993: 69).

Colin Renfrew's idea of peer polity interaction is also connected to a developing economy; however, the emphasis is not entirely on controlling aspects of production, but instead on the relationships between polities of equal rank (Renfrew 1986: 8). As mentioned above, the relationships can also centre on warfare, competitive emulation, symbolic entrainment and transmission of innovation. Renfrew states that these interrelationships can affect and stimulate the development of a polity, even towards becoming a nation state. The changes observed in material culture uniformities

coinciding with changes in the socio-economic structures present in a region represent the link between the interaction of polities and their competitive development (Shennan 1986: 137).

The use of social evolutionary models to explain the development of specific cultures does not often fully acknowledge the unique transformations (and stability) brought about by the actions of individuals and groups of individuals. By no means should a deterministic, one-way arrow type of development be assumed, judging the transition from bands-tribes-chiefdoms-states as an inevitable, nearly uniform process. There is a problem, however, if the result is an absence of a general framework, for viewing different types of societies, for disparate types of archaeological research to be discussed.

3. CRITIQUE OF SOCIAL EVOLUTIONARY MODELS

Some have suggested abandoning social evolutionary models altogether (Hodder 1986; Shanks and Tilley 1987). Ian Hodder stressed the importance of 'cultural meaning', the active individual and history (Hodder 1986: 13). He argues that the use of social evolutionary models implies that the relationships between behaviour and material culture, cause and effect, and fact and theory, have direct, universal, cross-cultural meanings where there are none. Shanks and Tilley state that many of the studies based on social evolutionary models assert cause and effect relationships between social systems and subsystems of environment, technology, etc. (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 117). Because of this, Shanks and Tilley find major fault with how the rate of change is viewed, with the pragmatic reasons given for change and with a lack of detailed scope for identifying change at different social levels.

In addition, Hodder argues that proponents of social evolutionary models have failed to acknowledge the problems of perspective associated with the individual culture and history, in other words, that the social and cultural contexts in the present affect viewing the past. Systems theory, specifically, has neglected the active contributions of individuals, regarding them instead as 'passive by-products of "the system"'. Structuralism, slightly improved the situation, according to Hodder, as it provided a

method and a theory for the analysis of material culture meanings. It also added the possibility of material culture and human activity *transforming* each other (Hodder 1986: 17-56). Structuralism and systems theory, however, both rely on the compartmentalisation of separate facets of social life, which join together to form a whole, and result in generalising about social evolution. Structuralism does alter the situation by addressing human motivation as a primary component above other sub-systems, such as economy and resources, but it does not fully escape the problem of limited variability through 'cause and effect' types of analysis.

Hodder is really arguing for what he calls 'contextual archaeology' (Hodder 1986: 121). This focuses on the specific conditions in place at each culture, through the "social and conceptual context of material production", and the abandonment of the use of universal, cross-cultural explanations. What is meant by this is that the "structured contents of symbolic codes" inherent in objects and behaviour can only be understood by identifying and studying the strategies and practices that are necessarily imbued in the two main types of context, according to Hodder. The first type of context refers to the object as an object, including the environmental, technological and behavioural context of action, which created the object. The second type of context refers to the object as meaningfully constituted, including the surrounding objects, time and place. Hodder attempts to create a new set of tools as part of 'post-processual' archaeology to escape the problems of cultural relativism, the negation of individual agency and the blurring of the distinctions between part/whole, and process/structure. In this way, object studies can become more than just comparing similar things, but a means of understanding the functional, ideational and symbolic meanings attached to those objects (Hodder 1986: 119-193).

Shanks and Tilley (1987) also reacted to the use of social evolutionary models to reconstruct past societies. They disagree with the functionalist and biological analogies inherent in many of the studies that utilise social evolutionary models. First, they feel that in the past, stability and status quo have been seen as the "natural system state"; however, Shanks and Tilley feel that change is a natural and constant practice. As a result of the previous view, 'function' has been heavily relied upon as an explanatory model for change, including concepts of practical interest, utilitarian

value and adaptive expedience. This leaves no room for 'irrational' or unexplainable reasoning behind choices, which brings us to the next point. Social evolutionary models negate the possibility for individual action dramatically affecting wider issues (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 117,118).

The two scholars also consider some of the related approaches. The Marxist approaches based on investigating modes of production, they feel, improved upon the systems approach by emphasising social transformations caused by conflict and contradiction. They add, however, that the reliance on investigating the relationship between modes of production and social relationships just results in fixed predetermined routes of analysis. Similarly, Shanks and Tilley feel that the concept of 'essentialism', treating social systems as single units consisting of pre-defined subsystems, including economy, environment, technology, population and social relations of production, is unhelpful. Part of the problem lies in our biased concept of 'society', and Shanks and Tilley propose that there is no unifying concept of society that can be used across time and space. The use of these pre-defined concepts as natural and timeless, they feel, creates a deterministic structuring of social reality, which in effect removes particular studies from the historical process. In effect, the individual is made invisible by the over-arching working of the essential subsystems, which are bound to change in set predictable ways (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 119, 120).

Shanks and Tilley then argue that it is precisely the individuals and social practices of individuals which create societies, and that they must be discerned from the big picture to understand societal change better (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 123). This is because every society is defined uniquely by the particular historical conditions and events that surround it. In their perception, a truly social archaeology would investigate 'social totalities' through the relationships between material culture-patterning, social practice, social strategies and social structures. Shanks and Tilley argue that, accepting the 'permanence of the potentiality for social change' and the importance of individual agency, means that a new perspective for investigating social transformations becomes possible (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 134).

4. DEVELOPMENT OF AGENCY THEORY

Agency theory aims to recognise the importance of the individual in the archaeological record. 'Agency' is related to the knowledge held by an individual that makes one's actions and choices meaningful and relevant (Barrett 1994: 5). Some authors neglect to specify their own definitions of the term 'agency', and have failed to help create a theoretical critique for use of the concept (Dobres and Robb 2000a: 3). In some ways social evolutionary models are still inherent in many recent works. The post-processual toolbox is not yet complete. Dobres and Robb point out five main problematic areas in the use of agency theory. The first point concerns the degree to which intentionality, or unintentionality, of agents' actions can determine social change. The second concerns if the scale at which agency exists can be determined, from individuals to groups, to collectives. The third relates to how the actions of individuals are able to result in long-term effects that out-live the individual agent, and if there are different types of relationships between agency and structure in different societies. The fourth point discusses the role of material culture in agency theory. The fifth point concerns the degree to which agency studies are biased reflections of modern, Western society, often from a middle-class male point of view (Dobres and Robb 2000a: 10-13).

The actions of individual agents are an undeniably important part of understanding cultures. But there are also important issues that could not be discussed when an extreme agency approach is applied. In some cases, analysis at the individual level is not fully possible. Analysis of group-level action, however, is often more evident in the archaeological record, and this should not be dismissed as unhelpful. There is some validity in stating general differences between, for instance, the types of organisations present in populations of less than one hundred or more than a few thousand. If there are no means of making cross-cultural comparisons or even minor generalisations, then future research will fail to progress further in studying other cultures. Examining past cultures at both the level of the individual and the broader context of the culture as a whole (as well as group or intermediate levels), does not necessarily have to be deterministic or judgmental. Some generalities can be maintained, so long as it is acknowledged that there is a large amount of variety in types of social organisations.

Many works have taken issue with the problems involved in using the major approaches. Stephen Shennan states that the social evolutionary approach neglects the involvement of the individual, and it mistakenly views state creation as an inevitable process (1993). Post-processual approaches focusing on the micro-scale, however, often ignore the context of decision-making, by not accounting for power differentials amongst the individuals, as well as the ideological framework within which the decisions are made. Shennan argues that cultural transmission is one key to understanding the distribution and use of social power. Archaeology, then ‘provides a record of social practices rather than abstracted/generalized social roles, and certainly not institutions, and that these practices are the outcomes of decisions made by the individual, which we can therefore reasonably hope to understand’ (Shennan 1993: 56). He argues that micro-scale analysis of how decisions are made at the level of real social actors, and how this affects social practices, is necessary to understanding the long-term social consequences (Shennan 1993: 53-58).

In relation to this, another possible means of understanding individual and social change is through a Neo-Darwinian, evolutionary approach. This is based on analogies with Darwinian theory, in an effort to understand the mechanisms and processes that produce both change and the maintenance of stability (Harre 1979: 7; Shennan 1996: 295). Accordingly, cultural and genetic transmission of ideas and instructions vary and change over time due to factors including individual intentionality, random errors, guided variation, bias and indirect bias (Boyd and Richerson 1985: 282; Cavalli-Sforza and Feldman 1981: 54, Shennan 1996: 286). Shennan sees this not only as a means of attempting to understand the evolution of human culture, but also as a way of integrating the important features of diffusion and emulation (Shennan 1996: 295).

Social and economic factors of cultural change have been the main foci of many studies, but only through a general model of cultural transmission, Shennan argues, can specific case studies be examined and better understood (Shennan 1996: 283). R. Boyd and P.J. Richerson define culture as “the information affecting [their] phenotype acquired by individuals by imitation or teaching” (Boyd, Richerson 1985: 283). It

follows then, that transmission of culture includes a certain amount of variation over time as things are imitated, emulated and learned differently, or simply ignored or forgotten, and that these factors greatly affect social and economic actions. Despite these processes, Boyd and Richerson believe that continuity is the expected outcome, rather than radical change (Boyd and Richerson: 80). Others emphasise the long-term context, such as the concept of 'replicative success' of artifacts (Leonard 2001: 71). This suggests, that "All traits, whether material or behavioral, have distributions in time and space" based upon variations in behavior and technology as phenotypal variation (Leonard 2001: 71; Leonard, Jones 1987: 214).

5. PROPOSAL

A consensus on the ways in which cultures should be investigated will probably never be reached. The concerns involved change gradually as new perspectives are created. For the moment, both the individual and societal levels of action are seen as the keys to understanding better how cultures develop. Some of the main emphases should for now be to work on the vocabulary used to discuss events and changes in society, as well as how the actions of individuals relate to the development of roles and statuses.

In some ways, problems involved in using both the major approaches of social evolution and agency theory seem compatible with each other. I believe it is possible to investigate societal change at the level of the individual, while still maintaining a perspective on how the actions of individuals relate to larger transformations within that society, as well as how these changes relate to other societies. The actions of individuals have consequences (Shennan 1993: 55; Runciman 1983: 29-32), intended and unintended, on short-and long-term time scales. Importantly, the decisions made by individuals that alter semi-egalitarian societies towards becoming societies with differential power relations, are crucial to understanding the character of non-egalitarian societies at both the individual and larger institutional or group levels. These transformations are created from unique sets of circumstances of inter-personal relations, but the resulting different forms of power relations can be seen to recur in certain instances in different times and places. The vocabulary we use to discuss the similarities and differences between societies/cultures has tended not to be flexible or

specific enough to describe the rich array of types of power relations, social organisations, etc.

The key to resolving the problem of over-generalising similarities between societies may possibly be to look at how the actions of individuals relate to the development of differentiated roles and statuses. The establishment of roles and statuses in societies that include responsibility over tasks, events, objects, etc., may be an important link between individual decision-making and the development of social or group institutions, including authoritative roles.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. VIEWS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL POWER FOR THE ETRUSCANS

The following section explores some of the main works related to the development of Etruscan society, and more particularly the presence of special statuses within the forming social hierarchies. Much recent scholarship starts with ancient written sources as a main investigative tool. This tactic is problematic, to say the least, because the sources are from other cultures and time periods (see the Limitations section, Chapter I.C, for a discussion). Because this is often the case, this section begins by describing what is said by classical sources, namely Livy, to then be able to examine critically other works that rely heavily on it. The following works have been divided into two parts: those which focus on cultural stimuli for change, and those which focus on religious and ritual roles, partly based on Etruscan connections with early Rome.

1. CLASSICAL SOURCES

The writings of the Roman historian Livy, from the late first century BC to early in the first century AD, give some possible insights into the political organisation of Veii during the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Livy's *Ab urbe condita* describes periods later than the ones under study here, but it does provide some information that may illuminate finds from the earlier archaeological evidence, or at least clarify how the Romans viewed the Etruscans during Livy's lifetime, which has been relied upon by many scholars as a secure description of the Etruscans.

In Book 4, Livy recounts the events of the Roman colony, Fidenae, revolting against Rome in 437 BC, and defecting to 'Lars Tolumnius', the *rex* of Veii to join them in battle (Livy, 4.17 Loeb translation by B.O. Foster 1960). Tolumnius agrees, and is later slain in battle (4.18). Livy goes on to mention that the 'Veientine senate' provoked another war with Rome in 406 BC (4.58 *senatus*). It is unclear what *rex* and *senatus* really mean, and whether this is just his way of describing events to Roman readers in the easiest way possible.

In Book 5, Livy describes the circumstances surrounding the ten-year siege of Veii. Turmoil within Rome and between the Etruscan towns prolonged the situation. The Veientes, 'weary of annual canvassing', chose a *rex* in 403 BC to prevent in-fighting and a lapse in leadership at a crucial time (5.1.3). He mentions the bad reputation this king had gained earlier, after ruining a festival when the 'Twelve Peoples had returned another man as priest in preference to him' (5.1). The appointment of this man as king worsened Veii's relations with other Etruscan towns, which apparently did not approve of this political decision. '[The Etruscan peoples] loathed not more the institution of kings than the King himself' (5.1, '*non maiore odio regni quam ipsius regis*'). The other Etruscan *gentes* then refused to help Veii defend itself as long as they obeyed a king. Livy describes them as the *gens*/nation which was devoted beyond all others to religious rites (and all the more because it excelled in the art of observing them) (5.1). Here Livy does not explain the previous system of choosing leaders. It is unclear if the main difference lies in who did the choosing, or the duration of the post.

The dates and the duration of the war between Rome and Veii may be incorrect. Ogilvie, in his critical commentary on Livy's *Ab urbe condita*, explains that it is in this period that the chronology of Roman history falls out by four years with Greek history, most probably owing to the dislocation of the second half of the fourth century in the *Annales* (Ogilvie 1965: 629). He suggests that it is more likely that Veii 'fell' to Rome in 392-1, rather than 396 BC. The exact dates of these events are not of primary concern here; rather, the agenda behind the writings of Livy can be more insightful. Livy uses this event to draw strong parallels with the Trojan War, likening the Romans to the heroic Greeks vanquishing the Trojans (Ogilvie 1965: 629, citing Zarncke 1848: 277). The main aim of Livy's history is to build a past for the Romans, and not to critically examine the political systems of the Etruscans.

Livy's reference to Veii being a 'kingdom' is interesting, as well as suggesting that the other Etruscan towns were opposed to this political system and the position of 'king'. His account of the war with Veii should be viewed critically, not only for his description of Etruscan social organisations, but also in the actual details concerning Rome and how this account fits into the wider argument, that Rome is politically

superior, and destined to outlast the Etruscans. He does not clarify what the role of king entailed in terms of political and religious authority. It is possible that Livy is suggesting the main difference is a long or lifetime tenureship for kings, as opposed to annual offices; the duties entailed cannot be inferred, however. It is likely that Livy did not know the intricate details of political duties and roles for the Etruscans. He may be assuming that the leadership in Etruscan towns was similar to that of Rome during the kingship period, when, in fact, the kings of Rome were Etruscan; however, there is not one uniform description that these kings conform to. Mythical or real, the kings at Rome are described by ancient authors as having many roles, combining sacred and secular power, such as Romulus and Numa holding the title of augur (Livy, 1.8 for Romulus, 1.18.7 for Numa), or having a warrior status, such as Tarquinius Priscus (Livy, 1. 26-38), or having administrative duties, such as Servius Tullius (Livy, 1. 42), or being tyrannical in nature, such as Tarquinius Superbus (Livy, 1.49). It is not necessarily the case that one or all of these aspects were present in the supposed Etruscan kings, such as at Veii, according to Livy.

Somewhat perplexing is the absence of any other kings at Veii being mentioned between Lars Tolumnius in 437 and the approximately thirty-four years until the next king was chosen in 403 (Ogilvie 1965: 632). The phrase referring to the Veientes, who 'weary of annual canvassing' (Livy 5.1.3), instead 'chose a king' is put in contrast to the Roman election at the same time, and seems to suggest that there had been annually elected offices for some time in Veii prior to 403 BC. In addition, the absence of this particular king's name seems to be an odd oversight, given the huge cast of characters, no matter how minor, whom Livy feels the need to mention throughout the rest of his *Ab urbe condita*. Livy probably uses the choosing of a king at Veii to demonstrate Veii's moral flaws and Rome's superiority morally and politically, as a partial explanation of why Rome is the final victor (Ogilvie 1965: 632).

Another interesting note comes after the fall of Veii. The Romans decide to perform the *evocatio* rite, to ask the goddess Juno to leave the temple at Veii and go to Rome (Livy, 5.22.5). Livy states that some of the army youths were chosen to carry the image of Juno back to Rome, and interestingly mentions that according to an Etruscan

practice, only the priest of a certain family was allowed to touch the statue (5.22.5). This possibly clarifies at least a partial separation of roles between king and priest at Veii during this period. The king is mentioned as performing sacrifices in the temple (Livy, 5.21.8), but presumably he is not the main religious, authoritative figure in the area. Perhaps this indicated a special segment of the society was associated with priesthood. It is also curious that the role of this priesthood was apparently determined by family, and possibly passed down in a hereditary manner.

2. CULTURAL STIMULI AND THE RISE OF THE ARISTOCRATS

The following section discusses how the rise of an aristocratic class affected Etruscan social structures. Mario Torelli discusses changes in the economic and familial spheres. Mauro Menichetti deals with the use of myth and its role in aristocratic expression. Both rely on similar sources of information, by mixing classical literature with archaeological evidence, to investigate social change during the Orientalising and Archaic periods.

Mario Torelli is one of the major scholars studying the development of Tyrrhenian Italy during the Archaic period, and the associated social transformations (Torelli 1983; 1988; 1997; 2001). For Torelli, dramatic social change began in the eighth century and heightened in the seventh century BC (Torelli 1989: 39). He sees the contacts between the indigenous cultures and the Greeks as a main stimulus for cultural change. Technological advances in modes of production, architectural and artistic skills led to inequalities, division of labour, social hierarchy and urbanisation. The particular religious and ideological environment of the Etruscans (and Latins for that matter), which originated from prehistoric periods, necessarily shaped the ways in which these skills were utilised (Torelli 1983: esp. 491-492; Torelli 1988: 54; Torelli 1989: 39). The architectural skills manifested themselves in the grand tumuli and *regiae* of the seventh and sixth centuries; the artistic skills allowed the structures themselves to be decorated and filled with ornamental items (Torelli 1983: 474-477).

Part of the socio-economic evolution, according to Torelli, also relates to the prevalence of conflict between communities, as well as a need to integrate groups of different origins within the communities. This began in the eighth century BC,

leading up to the Archaic transformation, and was characterised by war and conquest (Torelli 1988: 63; Torelli 1989: 39). Torelli believes that the powers based on the dependence of large groups of *clientes*, or clients, for agricultural and military labour are directly connected with the development of private property of land and profound social divisions (Torelli 1988: 57). It is unclear what Torelli's assumptions related to the creation of private property are based on, because he does not cite specific supporting evidence. The relationship between the *clientes* and the power structure has been the subject of debate, however, and may have been associated with large groups of clansmen, rather than allegiance to a small number of elites (Smith 1996: 190). The complex socio-economic structure, according to Torelli, was such that local potentates, emerging groups from proto-urban centres and others from the countryside cooperated together, resulting in social stratification (Torelli 1983: 482). The aristocrats relied on the acquisition of objects and the adoption of cultural models from the East and Greece, according to Torelli, which in turn increased the demand for exotic goods and craft specialisation (Torelli 1989: 39). The *emporia* locations with religious and economic functions show the diverse nature of the developments of the region, as well as the dynamics between central and marginal positions (Torelli 1983: 485).

According to Torelli, these political and economic developments coincide with an elaboration of ideology in the religious sphere (Torelli 1988: 54), to the extent that the Archaic conception of power was intrinsically tied to ritual practices and duties. The urban developments of the Etruscan cities were also crucial. First, according to Torelli, the aristocrats in possession of land broke free from the original settlement structures based around the village as a community, and reshaped the tribal and ethnic affinities through the new socio-political organism only possible with urbanisation. Then, the monumentalisation and 'chiusura', or closing off, of sacred and public buildings in the seventh century BC led to the birth of urban sanctuaries and extra-urban *emporia*. The transmission of objects and artistic skills through exchange had repercussions on the economy and social stratification. During the sixth and fifth centuries, however, the large cities extended their territories and destroyed the residences of the minor potentates, i.e. Acquarossa, Castelnuovo Berardenga and Murlo, according to Torelli. (Torelli 1988: 54-68).

As for the monumental complexes in Etruria and Lazio, Torelli refers to them as ‘monumentali residenze gentilizie’, stating that they were centres of public and private life (Torelli 2001: 67). For Torelli, the discoveries of several *regiae*, or palatial structures, illustrate a radical break in cultural innovations from the Villanovan period, which coincided with changes in funerary practices, economy, social structure and ideology. The structures themselves indicate the creation of elevated social statuses of families with pretences to hegemonic or regal roles (Torelli 2001: 68-69). The architectural terracottas, and the figured friezes in particular, on these *regiae* celebrate ‘i riti e i valori’, and represent the power of the dominant aristocrats resident in the structures (Torelli 1997: 113).

Torelli points out that the architectural figured friezes from the sixth century BC mark a divorce from the technical and stylistic motifs found in ceramics, and came to embody the new political, religious and cultural conditions of the period. The architectural terracottas from the *regiae* at Murlo and Acquarossa exemplify how the ideology and the instruments of religious consensus were utilised by the dominant classes (Torelli 1983: 478; reiterated by Sassatelli 2001: 145). Torelli explores the idea of the Italian *regiae* originating in the East, such as the palace at Larissa on Hermos, or Anatolia and northern Syria. Because of this connection, Torelli questions how to interpret the iconography present on the frieze plaques from structures such as Murlo (see below in B.4 for a discussion of these interpretations, including Torelli’s). He emphasises, however, the importance of *maiores*, or ancestors, within Etruscan ceremony, and that the construction of the aristocratic house, or *oikos*, with allusions to the ancestors, were both central to religious ideology (Torelli 1983: 481; cf. Steingraber 2002: 130-138; Colonna and von Hase 1984: 38-39). Torelli states that although many similar symbols associated with power are shared between the East and Tyrrhenian Italy, the power structures, ideologies and economic bases are wholly different (Torelli 1983: 477-482).

All of this then changed yet again. Torelli states that in c. 500 BC, the monarchies that ruled the Etruscan cities were replaced with republican magistrates. This is evidenced in the construction of ‘collective, non-gentilitial sacred buildings’,

including large-scale urban temples with rich votive deposits, which indicate a process of isonomy, or an equalizing effect on the society. The new decorative motifs of these temples should be seen as the result of changes in the ethical and political atmosphere (Torelli 2000b: 22-23).

Torelli has initiated a deep discussion into these crucial aspects of Archaic Tyrrhenian Italy. He rightly discusses the importance of the monumental complexes and their decorations in terms of social hierarchy and ideology. He strives to make the appropriate connections between cultural contacts, urbanisation and social practices. The suggestion that the developments of private armies and private property of land led to social changes, is overstating what can be deduced. These potential developments are not clearly designated in the archaeological record, but rather inferred; what is more, it is assumed that their creation would be dependent on social changes already in motion. Certain questions remain unasked by Torelli, however. The ideology resulting from the 'borrowing' of symbols from the East and readapting them to suite the contexts of central Italy is still unclear. The social, political and religious messages expressed in items, such as the figured friezes from the monumental complexes, continue to be debated. More importantly, we do not understand the relationship between the social, political and religious spheres yet. And how did particular individuals related to these spheres figure in the developing social hierarchy in order to become elites?

Another Italian scholar, Mauro Menichetti, for instance, suggests that 'Tyrrhenian *principes* or *reges*' ruled the area from the early Iron Age until the sixth century BC. That is until 'isonomic trends' surfaced in Etruria, and resulted in the disappearance of 'Tyrrhenian archaic royalty' (Menichetti 2000: 205). He does, however, acknowledge the complexity involved. He states that it is difficult to define this royalty due to 'the multitude of incentives and references that vary in time at each community' with different contexts, traditions, monuments and complexity of archaic thought, which were all deeply influenced by religion. The power base was legitimised through the repeated use of insignia of political-religious power, an abundance of exotic objects and ceremonies, an importance placed on the princes' genealogy, a special relationship with the gods, partly visible through burial, and by

the seventh century BC, assimilating their identities with those of Greek mythical heroes. This special relationship with the gods, Menichetti believes, is evidenced in a few of the early monumental tombs, such as the Tomb of the Statues at Ceri. The two statues in the tomb are depicted holding 'attributes of power', with one holding a sceptre or fan, and the other holding a possible *lituus*. The *lituus* shows a connection with the gods by indicating a kingly divinatory capacity; according to Menichetti, the combination of religious associations and political power is the key characteristic of archaic royalty (Menichetti 2000: 205-206). The *lituus* will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter VI.

The origins of power, for Menichetti's Tyrrhenian royalty, depend on three main ingredients. These are 'regal type' figures, who originated in the protohistoric period, with the 'diffusion of models' from the Orient and Greek worlds defining the appearance of royalty, and further contact with the Greek world to finally adhere to the ideals of Homeric royalty with the infusion of myth (Menichetti 2000: 207; the importance of myth is reiterated by Sassatelli 2001: 152). This is also in addition to the development of new cultivation techniques and the parcelling-out of private property, according to Menichetti (Menichetti 2000: 207, citing Peroni 1996: 478ff.). Menichetti goes on to state that the elite social groups were able to acquire more land than the other social groups, which created an aristocratic class separate from the unfortunate rest, the evidence of which is the display of wealth and military strength of the aristocrats during the eighth century (Menichetti 2000: 207). However, by the end of the eighth century, the same emblems of military strength, such as bronze shields in burials, are transformed to express a 'gentilitial continuity' and heroism (Menichetti 2000: 215; Menichetti 1994: 33-34).

According to Menichetti, the complex system of symbols was transformed, by separating the *manus*, literally 'hand', or power held by the *pater familias* over his family, and the *hasta*, symbol of power for the *rex* (as defined by Menichetti) (Menichetti 2000: 215). He asserts that prior to this transformation of the symbols, power often combined roles similar to those of the head of the family over his wife, in particular, property, and the right, after due process, to execute, with a more legal aspect of legal ownership (see *OCD* and *RE manus* and *hasta*). These concepts;

however, are arguably particular to the Roman Republic. The power base of the *rex* then becomes broader to cover differing social solidarities. This is also related to the monumental structures and their terracotta decorations. The large *regiae*, such as at Murlo, with terracotta statues possibly depicting ancestors, indicate a power based on *manus* (Menichetti 2000: 221). In contrast, *regiae*, such as at Rome, with terracotta statues of mythical figures including Heracles, show the use of myth and heroic feats in the context of kingly power. The importance of the *imagines maiorum* or ancestors, is illustrated in some of the most lavish tombs of the seventh century. The Tomba della Statua at Ceri and the Tomba delle Cinque Sedia at Cerveteri demonstrate the power of these figures in a new sphere or *casa*, in the same way the rooftop statues from Murlo express the power of the aristocrats in the living world (Menichetti 1988: 101-103, 114-117; Menichetti 1994: 24-26, 36). The statues and frieze plaques helped legitimise the power of the *princeps*, according to Menichetti, as well as likening the aristocratic lifestyle to that of the gods (Menichetti 1994: 38, 90). He stresses that this period was marked by ambiguity between the public and private spheres, and cites the *regiae* at Murlo as an example (Menichetti 1994: 38). As a result, the sacred sphere is key to this ambiguity because of its connection with the private sphere of the aristocrats, and yet also necessarily relates to public functions. Menichetti states that during the sixth century the princely culture began its decline, which, by the end of the century, is indicated by the use of myth on temple structures, rather than princely scenes (Menichetti 2000: 221-224).

Menichetti's work manages to tie in many of the crucial types of change occurring during the ninth to sixth centuries BC. Some of the assumptions regarding evidence of changes in the power structure do seem problematic, however. First, there is no clear evidence of 'isonomic' trends behind the apparent changes of power base. Menichetti inappropriately makes a cross-cultural comparison, by transposing a Greek political trend that became prominent during the sixth and fifth centuries (cf. for example, Morris 1987: 205-210), onto sixth century Etruria. There are no clear signs of separation between the power of the king and the power of the father, or even evidence of 'differing social solidarities' resulting in an equalising effect on the population (Menichetti 2000: 215). The power base of the leaders, who were not necessarily kings, and the make-up of the societies, has yet to be determined. Over

time, within each Etruscan community, the power holders' basis for leadership may have been transformed owing to a complex set of causes. The Oriental and Greek influences on the Etruscan 'royalty' were great, particularly with regard to the material culture during the eighth and seventh centuries. These influences, however, must have occurred as an added feature to an already existing system with authoritative leaders; the exotic prestige goods functioned as a strong expression of this.

Menichetti's, just as Torelli's, model of the creation of private property with unequal access developed during this period, is based on unclear evidence. These ideas are based on assumptions, such as defined burial groups suggesting connections to land, hut-shaped funerary urns, an increased number of grave goods and the diffusion of writing (Menichetti 1988: 79; Peroni 1996: 478ff.). Spatial organisation within necropoleis, and placement of funerary monuments in the landscape, may indicate other social changes, including attempts by groups to legitimize continued use of an area of land based on descent from their ancestors (Chapman and Randsborg 1981: 7-8; Parker Pearson 1999: 29). Moreover, modern connotations attached to the term 'private property' may not be appropriate to describe the social changes occurring in this context. Anthropology has provided a number of examples where land usage and concepts of ownership do not conform to capitalist practices. Menichetti's statement that the involvement of terracotta statues in human form indicates a sort of propaganda for legitimising the power base is interesting. It is possible, however, that the use of ancestor images and mythical heroes coincided for a long period, even within the same structure- possibly at the Portonaccio Temple at Veii with statues of gods, Heracles, and an unknown warrior figure. The combination of mythical and real individuals can be seen as late as the Hellenistic period, as for example in the François Tomb.

3. PRIESTHOODS AND RITUAL POWER

The following section deals largely with the development of priesthoods and political control through religious spheres. Ambros Joseph Pfiffig concentrates on the workings of Etruscan religion, through its practitioners and contexts. Timothy

Cornell works with the development of early Rome and Etruria, and how the religious roles of leaders transformed through interaction between the cultures. Elena Tassi Scandone attempts to define the form and function of religious symbols found in Rome and Etruria.

Pfiffig (1975) is concerned with clarifying the roles of religious practitioners in Etruria and Rome. In general, sacral persons were needed for sacrifices and other cultic procedures, according to Pfiffig. Despite citations of specific religious roles or individuals in ancient literature (for example Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 5.1.5; Cicero, *Ad fam.* 6.6, *De div.* 1, *De harusp.* 9; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.15), according to Pfiffig, it is impossible to say that all aristocrats were priestly; however, specialised knowledge and ability to carry out sacred practices were passed down in a hereditary manner within aristocratic families in some cases (Pfiffig 1975: 44, 45; also Livy 5.21.8). He states that particular priesthoods existed within different aristocratic families and 'state positions'. Also, according to Pfiffig, the highest priest of Etruria, the *Sacerdos Etruriae*, was elected (Pfiffig 1975: 46; Livy 5.1.5). He also states that some Etruscan kings had priestly roles, but were not permanently priests. For example, the ruler named on the Pyrgi tablets, Thefarie Velianas, is the founder and protector of the sacellum, *munistas uvas tamerescia*, but there is no evidence of his being a priest (Pfiffig 1975: 49). Similarly, the *Lucomonies*, a possible Etruscan word for 'king' (see section III of this chapter), were responsible for the writing down of the Etruscan Discipline (hereafter ED), but were also not priests (see Rawson 1978: 135). Pfiffig states that there was no formal caste of priests; however, knowledge of the ED was necessary (Pfiffig 1975: 44-49).

Pfiffig then looks at the development of *haruspices*, as one of the most important ritual statuses. He states that the *haruspices* generally fulfill the most important aspects of priesthood. Their main tasks were interpreting the entrails of sacrificed animals and different types of lightning bolts. Interestingly, Pfiffig states that the judgements of the *haruspices* seem aristocratic and anti-democratic. The Etruscans had to supply Rome with *haruspices*, presumably prior to the mid-second century BC, when the Senate began sending Romans to Etruria to learn the haruspicy craft, as this was seen as an Etruscan specialty (Cicero, *De div.* 1.42). In Rome, however, they had

no official character; several would be consulted at once to advise on a pressing matter (see Rawson 1978: 145). Tarquinia seems to have been an important centre for haruspicy, with evidence of two specific haruspices coming from the city, as well as it becoming the seat of the college during the Roman Empire. The *Flamines* in Rome may have borrowed much from the Etruscan *haruspices*, including clothing, a head covering referred to as an *apex*, the *lituus*, sacrificial knife and axe (Pfiffig 1975: 45-48).

Augury and bird observation was also shared between Etruria and Rome, according to Pfiffig. Whereas Etruscan specialists could interpret the significance of lightning, Roman augurs merely used lightning as a 'yes or no' response to a pre-posed question (Pfiffig 1975: 151). According to Pfiffig, the Romans built a discipline for augury based on Etruscan ritual knowledge, of which Romulus was the first proponent (ibid; Cicero, *De nat deor.* 2.4.10, *De div* 1.17.33, 2.34.74). Bird observation was also used differently. For Etruscan augurs, birds and other types of natural phenomena were observed for their significance, their interpretations were then applied to specific contexts (Pfiffig 1975: 151; Dion. Hal. 3.70.5; Strabo, 17.c.8.13.43). Roman augurs, on the other hand, would pose a specific question, and then release birds for observation (Pfiffig 1975: 152; Servius *ad Aen.* 1.398).

Pfiffig suggests that aristocracy and priestly roles were not mutually exclusive, but very much related. In some cases, political leadership was accompanied by religious authority or responsibility to a certain degree. It is interesting to note that Pfiffig associates haruspicy with anti-democratic rule. At this point, it is difficult to say if this is an accurate depiction of the Archaic period, or if it is based on assumptions related to Rome's later supremacy. The next author deals with some of the problematic means of separating Etruscan and Roman practices related to the ritual and political spheres.

Cornell discusses the development of early Rome within the wider context of Tyrrhenian Italy, much of which involves investigating the relationships between Etruscan settlements and Rome through social, political, and religious institutions using historical and archaeological evidence (Cornell 1995). Cornell strongly states

that, during the Archaic period, Rome and the Etruscan cities differed in language and ethnic identity, but were characterised by similar material culture, social structure and institutions. After the construction of the Roman Republic, however, Roman society changed in three major ways: the *plebs* gaining political power, conquests stimulating economic contacts with other civilisations, and increasing diversity within the citizen body. The Etruscan cities, Cornell argues, did not transform at all, but rather ‘remained largely static and comparatively isolated’, with a ‘fossilised social system similar to that which had obtained at Rome before the emancipation of the *plebs*’ (Cornell 1995: 165).

According to Cornell, the Archaic period was a crucial time of horizontal social mobility, where individuals and groups could move between communities based on shared understandings of wealth, family backgrounds and reputation, rather than origin, ethnicity, or the later concepts of nationality and citizenship (Cornell 1995: 158). The key for these societies, according to Cornell, is the presence of ‘condottieri’, or aristocratic warlords (Cornell 1995: 143, note 73). These individuals drew their power from private armies, which acted independently of formal governments or boundaries. This tyrannical leadership was a particular characteristic of the Roman monarchy during the sixth century, and succeeded in curbing the power of the aristocracy with the support of the plebian masses (Cornell 1995: 235; Wissowa 1912: 520). He likens the eventual overthrow of tyranny in Rome to developments across much of the Mediterranean, and particularly in Greek cities, where constitutional political systems distributed power between aristocrats and citizens (Cornell 1995: 231).

Etruria marks a contrast, however, with evidence of kingships remaining after 500 BC, according to Cornell. Lars Porsenna from Clusium is referred to as *rex* (*RE* ‘Porsenna’; Jannot 1988: 601-611), Livy’s account of a *rex* at Veii in the 430’s and in 396 BC, and an inscription from Tarquinia referring to a king of Caere called Orgolnius in the fifth century, or possibly later (Torelli 1975: 45ff., Cornell 1978: 170-2; Cornell 1995: 231).¹ Cornell admits that it is difficult to decipher how parts of

¹ Cornell is skeptical of Torelli’s restoration of *Orgoln[iu]m Veltur[---]ensi[---] / Caeritum regem imperio expu[lit--]*, to mean he was *rex sacrorum* (Torelli 1975: 77). Cornell suggests ... *exp[ulsum restituit--]*, to

non-Roman Italy governed itself, particularly Etruscan cities, where the independent entities probably did not have uniform institutions. However, he does venture to say that some Etruscan cities probably had a hierarchy of different magistrates with specialised functions, with the title *zilath purthne* outranking the others (Cornell 1995: 230). The Pyrgi tablets, for example, describe Thefarie Velianas as the *zilath* of Caere. The meaning behind this title is sometimes described as the equivalent of a Latin *praetor*, although it seems in this case he was not an annually elected magistrate, but rather in the third year of his rule. The Phoenician text from the tablets describes him as a *melek*, which is thought to mean ‘king’. Cornell then likens Thefarie Velianas’ stated connection with the goddess Uni-Astarte, to the tyrannical ideal of the ‘sacred marriage’, where the tyrant bases his legitimacy on an intimate relationship with a goddess (Cornell 1995: 146, 233).

The creation of the Roman Republic is also responsible for the creation of new titles, at the end of the sixth to early fifth centuries BC, the meanings of which are debatable. The political developments in Rome during this period may be highly relevant to examining the interworkings of political hierarchies in Etruscan cities, given the close connections between them. During the creation of the Republic, the former responsibilities related to the sacred duties of the king were distributed between the two consuls, the *rex sacrorum* and the *pontifex maximus* (Cornell 1995: 235; Wissowa 1912: 103, 503-504). The position of *rex sacrorum*, Cornell argues, may have existed before the creation of the Republic; therefore, there may have been a period of transition at Rome during the reigns of the last two kings, Servius Tullius and Tarquinius Superbus. During this period, each tyrant usurped the rule of the true *rex sacrorum*, and subsequently Rome was ruled by a double monarchy of the head priest and a tyrant during the sixth century (Cornell 1995: 236). Because of this, Cornell suggests, the redefining of the *rex sacrorum* during the Republic reflects both concerns over maintaining ritual and cult practices, and fears of the sacred role being combined with political power. As a result, the *rex sacrorum* was barred from political office.

suggest that because Tarquinia seems to have been pro-monarchy; as suggested by Livy (5.16.2-4), Tarquinia installed a king at Caere to detach the latter’s connection with Rome.

Interestingly, the period which Cornell characterises as one of political turmoil, coincides with the destruction of three central ritual structures in Rome: the Regia, the Comitium area and the Sant'Omobono sanctuary were all burnt down around 500 BC (Cornell 1995: 237; for the Comitium, see Coarelli 1998: 139). Cornell suggests that the Sant'Omobono sanctuary was not rebuilt because of its strong connection with the tyrants, particularly Servius Tullius who may have dedicated the temple (Cornell 1995: 146; Coarelli 1992: 221). The many phases of the Regia are part of a large debate (see Figures IV.108, 109). It is believed to have been the site for the kings' official duties, followed by the *rex sacrorum* and finally the *pontifex maximus*. Although it is probable that the only king to reside in the Regia was Numa (Coarelli 1983: 56-57; Cornell 1995: 239-240; Brown 1974-5: 15-30; Brown 1976: 11-12; Plutarch, *Numa* 14.1; Dion. Hal. fr. 6.2 refers to Numa performing official duties at the Regia, but residing at the Quirinal). While its functions are debated, it does seem at least that the fifth phase of the Regia was rebuilt in a different fashion c. 500 BC, and may reflect changes in the functions of its main resident (Cornell 1995:239; Brown 1967: 47-60; Brown 1974-75: 15-36; Brown 1976: 5-12).

Cornell's work provides an interesting hypothesis regarding the possible political and religious developments of Archaic Rome and Etruria. Many of the conclusions, however, are drawn in order to explain why Rome succeeded, and Etruscan settlements did not. This means of working backwards assumes there is a clear distinction between the two areas which just needs to be illuminated in order to explain the outcome— whatever course Rome took was obviously the right one, and what transpired at Etruscan settlements obviously resulted in their demise. I disagree with Cornell that the Etruscan cities did not see many of the changes that occurred in Rome relating to the stimulation of economic markets, the diversity of the 'citizen' body, and a widening of the power base. During the sixth century, Etruscan settlements may not have successfully participated in conquests of other settlements, but they did engage in sea battles for the protection and expansion of trade routes; they, of course, also maintained extensive trade contacts with other parts of Italy and the Mediterranean (Gras 2000: 98). Most importantly, as will be shown later, this period marked a period of struggle for political power. It must be added though that

these events did not happen homogeneously at all Etruscan settlements; some prospered and some did not.

However, Cornell rightly blurs the firm line between Rome and Etruria that many others insist upon. The networks amongst these individuals existed because of shared practices, not the least, demonstrated by the Etruscan origins of several of the early kings of Rome. The unique administrative and political changes in Rome are one of the keys, which resulted in its success, as Cornell suggests. It is uncertain, however, if some of these similar ideas were not equally present at some of the Etruscan settlements. As for tyrants with armies, these individuals should probably be viewed as the exception. The creation of several specific roles for the distribution of power in Republican Rome and the destruction of some of the ritual structures is interesting, in relation to possible development at Etruscan settlements.

Elena Tassi Scandone (2001) investigates the development of powerful roles in Rome and Etruria from a different angle, that of special symbols—the ‘verghe’, ‘scuri’ and ‘fasci littori’ (or the crooked cane, axes and bundle of rods). These symbols became crucial identifiers of special authority, or *insignia imperii*, in the Roman Republic; however, their origins may stem from Archaic Etruria. Tassi Scandone strives to define better their origins as part of her wider aim to define the roles of these symbols in Hellenistic Italy. She makes important distinctions in categorising these items, mainly that Roman *fascies* are not the same as Etruscan *fascies*, and that the one example of *fascies* found at the Etruscan site of Vetulonia does not mean that all Etruscan *fascies* are identical to it (Tassi Scandone 2001: esp 155-161). In fact, images of the Etruscan *fascies* from the Hellenistic period differ from the Vetulonian *fascies* in the type of axe, central staff and way of tying the rods together (Tassi Scandone 2001: 27). She also believes that the origins of the ‘scuri’ or axes, may indicate that the Etruscans practised capital punishment (Tassi Scandone 2001: 179, 192-199). The duties of the lictors in early Republican Rome, including clearing a path for the officer with imperium, implementing the rights of arrest, summons, and execution (see *OCD lictores*), may have held a real threat of capital punishment in this context, however, does not necessarily relate to the earlier Etruscan contexts with different authoritative roles. Interestingly, Tassi Scandone uses the assembly scenes

on Chiusine urns for her discussion of the Hellenistic period (Figure II.1) (Tassi Scandone 2001: esp. 155-161, tav. 3), which for the purposes of my project, could be seen as the progression of the assembly scenes from the frieze plaques at the monumental complexes.

B. VIEWS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF RITUAL STRUCTURES AND POWER FOR THE ETRUSCANS

This section deals with the potential social changes inherent in the formalisation and monumentalisation of ritual space, and monumental architecture more widely for the Etruscans. Much recent work has been done on the form and location of ritual space for the Etruscans, however, the description of Etruscan temple form from the Roman architect Vitruvius, is an underlying current in almost every piece. Because of this, the work of Vitruvius will be discussed first, followed by the recent works that rely or attempt to move beyond his description. This section is divided into four main parts, including: classical sources, landscape-based models, form and decoration focused works, and finally, a discussion of one of the most widely debated decoration types, the 'Seated Assembly' scene frieze plaques.

1. CLASSICAL SOURCES

The Roman architect Vitruvius, writing in the first century BC, described what he believed was the template of the Etruscan temple, or what he called the Tuscan style (Figure II.3) (Vitruvius, *De Arch* 4.7, *tuscanicis dispositionibus*). He drew up a list of strict dimensions that these temples were expected to meet, with the temple length in six parts and the breadth in five parts. The length is divided in two, with the front for the portico area and the rear for the temple interior. The width of the rear area was divided in tenths with three parts reserved for both of the *alae* or wings on the left and right, and four parts for the central shrine. Two rows of four columns were in line with the outer and interior walls. Even the columns are given very specific dimensions, with the diameter of the base being one seventh of the height, and the height is one third of the width of the temple.

The Vitruvian model has been used numerous times as a starting point to fit missing data of what no longer remains of many Etruscan ritual structures into a clear mould. The three *cellae* notion, stating that the rear of the interior is divided into thirds, for instance, has been a constant expectation. With regard to the Portonaccio temple at Veii, Ward-Perkins states that the proposed three *cellae* were possibly not the most appropriate way of reconstructing the structure (Ward-Perkins 1961: 30; contra Stefani 1953: 29-112). In reality, no two Etruscan temples are exactly alike; in fact, there is a huge array of variability. The description left by Vitruvius pertains largely to the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter in Rome, which was believed to have Etruscan origins. The degree of variability in ritual structures before this period is a crucial means of investigating the unique developments of the settlements and their communities.

2. LANDSCAPE APPROACHES TO RITUAL

This section discusses approaches to the study of Etruscan ritual space by structuring the landscape. Giovanni Colonna and Ingrid Edlund both divide the landscape into concentric rings surrounding urban space; the function and control of ritual space depends on its placement within these areas. Together Corinna Riva and Simon Stoddart have used a similar idea of distance from urban spaces, however, with an added element of ritualised boundaries affecting placement and function over ritual space.

In the exhibition catalogue *Santuari d' Etruria* (1985a), Colonna attempts to redefine the appropriate means of investigating Etruscan ritual space. He is concerned with the predominance of ritual structures and their contents in exhibitions and studies concerning the development of Etruscan culture, which, in his opinion, often over-emphasises the religious aspects. Because of this, he struggles to place the Etruscan sanctuary between public and private spheres, between religious and profane, between the collective belief and individual self-representation, and between the demands of exchange and the desire to hoard treasures (Colonna 1985a: 21). Colonna strives to represent sanctuaries as a reflection of the community, and eventually the city. Sanctuaries served many functions, according to Colonna, including early forms of

monumental architecture, homes for the *sacellum*, places of sacrifice and devotion, expressions of mythology and art, such as sculpture, areas of trading in some cases, and as centres of writing (Colonna 1985a: 23-26). He considers the development of ritual architecture as directly related to domestic architecture, the *oikos* in particular, and the construction and organisation of urban space (Colonna 1985a: 53, 60).

Colonna then divides the Etruscan sanctuaries into categories of urban, suburban, extra-urban, those associated with necropoleis, as well as others in rural South Etruria, and others in North and Apennine Etruria. Urban sanctuaries were located within the perimeters of a settlement, in some cases within city walls, for protection, but located at junctions in the roads near the city gates to satisfy rites of passage and purification (Colonna 1985a: 68; Coarelli 1983: 111-117). Suburban sanctuaries make up a large category of ritual structures located just outside city walls, usually at a stopping point, such as a spring or crossroads (Colonna 1985a: 98). The sanctuaries located in the necropoleis illustrate the relationship between a community and its dead to conduct cult and sacrificial rites, which may have been initiated by the first elite families to build the grand tumuli during the Orientalising and early Archaic periods (Colonna 1985a: 116). Extra-urban sanctuaries are defined as being located at long distances from the city, while yet maintaining a strong connection with it. They often functioned as part of emporia and were frequented by traders from across the Mediterranean (Colonna 1985a: 127). Sanctuaries in the open countryside of southern Etruria, where farming families disparately spread across an area, are difficult to trace. Ritual sites are found, however, in the internal districts, or territories, of cities, where *oppida* or *castella* have been allowed to develop with a pseudo-urban appearance (Colonna 1985a: 149). The sanctuaries in the countryside of northern and Apennine Etruria are less monumental in structure as one travels north. The 'internal territory' was characterised by rural sanctuaries for tribal worship, which predates much of what is found in southern Etruria, as shown by the stylistic development of the votive objects. Ritual sites without temple structures or architectural terracottas existed during the Archaic period. The bronze votives, according to Colonna, illustrate that the kind of worship continued unhampered here, as it did in proto-urban Etruria where gentilitial cults became involved in aristocratic display. The area surrounding Chiusi is an exception, however, which is

characterised by a large number of architectural terracotta fragments and worship related to water, suggested by the discovery of votive deposits in bodies of water (Colonna 1985: 160).

Colonna rightly points out the difficulties in defining Etruscan sanctuaries because of their multiple purposes and unique forms, although this work is an exhibition catalogue which does not leave room for more developed discussions of these topics. Fortunately, he does mention regional differences in practices, and possible environments, which produced them. On the other hand, his system of categorising sanctuaries by their location in relation to the urban centre, may not be the most appropriate for studying the development of ritual space. This results in mixing sanctuaries of different time periods, functions, and possibly social contexts (see the following section for a lengthier discussion of categorisation problems).

In *The Gods and the Place*, Edlund investigates the relationship between the location and function of sanctuaries in Etruria and Magna Graecia (Edlund 1987). With goals similar to that of Colonna, she organises ritual spaces and structures into categories of: sacred places in nature, which are usually located in grove or spring areas; rural sanctuaries which are located in the countryside and are independent of a city's influence; extra-urban sanctuaries which are outside the city area but are administered by the city and serve the city-dwellers' interests; extra-mural sanctuaries which represent a subdivision of extra-urban and are located just outside the city area; and political sanctuaries whose locations can vary, but are administered by a number of communities or cities and serve as a neutral meeting place (Edlund 1987: 42). Their distance from an urban centre, or lack of a structure in the cases of sacred places in nature, defines their relationship with the urban centre and their function, according to Edlund (Edlund 1987: 41, 42, also Chapter VI). The development of ritual spaces transformed as sacred spots in nature became incorporated into the construction of settlements, including votive deposits, altars, structures and, eventually, temples (Edlund 1987: 144).

Edlund further describes the chronology and typologies of sacred spaces in Etruria. She defines the earliest type of sanctuary as the 'meeting hall' which includes the

earliest deposits of bronze statuettes, such as the Lower Building at Murlo, dating to the seventh century. This period is described as a time of experimentation in determining location and function of extra-urban and rural sanctuaries. During the sixth century, Etruscan 'temples' were developed alongside an increased number of votive deposits. The late sixth century is seen as a critical time of change, with towns, such as Acquarossa, and 'political sanctuaries', such as Murlo, being destroyed, along with political turmoil in Rome affecting Etruscan cities. Then, the fourth century marks an evolution in cult practices and ritual structures, seen in changes in form and function of many pre-existing sanctuaries, with the addition of new types of votives (Edlund 1987: 144, 145).

Edlund's work is a major contribution to the study of Etruscan ritual space through its compilation of a vast amount of information; however, I would argue that her system of categorising ritual space by relative location is too restrictive to discuss social developments for the Etruscans. Distance from urban centres is not the most insightful means of determining the function of ritual spaces.² On the contrary, this categorisation mixes structures of different ages from pre-urban to fully urban periods. Ritual activity at many of the ritual places and structures began before the existence, or at least the monumentalisation of potential settlements. As Edlund rightly points out, the original impetus behind the identification of most ritual spaces is related to an 'awe of nature', and a sense of inherent specialness to an area (Edlund 1987: 30; Eliade 1959: 20). Their distance from a later urban centre should not, then, be the primary consideration. The relationship between the construction of monumentalised ritual structures and the construction of associated and/or nearby settlements is an interesting one when the contexts of these developments are investigated together. The ritual structures are products of specific circumstances related to religious needs and site development; their location may not be directly relevant to defining the social and political scenarios behind their creation.

The so-called 'administration' of these sanctuaries should not be assumed to be self-evident from their distance in relation to a settlement. The issue of control over these

² Other scholars, such as de Polignac (1994, 1995) have used terms such as 'extra urban' for Greek contexts, but I will not be discussing them here.

places is the key to understanding their function and survival, but it is a complicated problem which must address the development of the settlements as a whole. It is entirely possible that ritual structures, including those from the centres of settlements and those that are a few kilometres away, were controlled not by the 'city' at large, but by smaller groups defined by different religious practices, social groups, familial ties, etc. Because of this the degree of control is not determined by distance from the settlement centre, but instead by religious, social, political and economic considerations. For instance, some individuals or groups living at Caere may have felt stronger connections, or had more control at the distant Pyrgi temples than at the temples in the centre of the settlement, given a different connection with the trading port and different divinities, which may have changed over time.

In addition, the category of 'political sanctuary' is far too limited. Edlund identifies the legendary reference to the *Fanum Voltumnae*, as well as the sites of *Lucus Feroniae* and *Murlo* as political sanctuaries, which served as meeting places for multiple communities. I argue, however, that all of the ritual structures contained an element of the political, and it is the unravelling of the political messages behind their construction, and sometimes destruction, which should be investigated. *Murlo*, in particular, gives the impression of distinctly being not neutral politically, given its ritual destruction (Edlund 1994: 16; see Glinister 2000: 61-64 for a discussion of ritual destruction).

Edlund concludes that sanctuary structures allow the relationships between religious, social and political spheres of the Etruscans to be illuminated, because the development of powerful cities determined the location and form of the sanctuaries (Edlund 1987: 92).³ She adds that the location of extra-mural sanctuaries and the monumentalisation of rural sanctuaries show a strong connection between the urban and extra-urban populations in their cult practices and importance. In contrast, I would suggest that the foundation and location of many ritual sites in Etruria that pre-

³ I assume that Edlund (1987) is referring to the form and location of later sanctuaries on the basis of another statement—that in Etruria, the development of urban settlements was gradual, and the pre-existing sacred places continued to be used, with new sanctuaries being determined by the location and formation of the city (130). Edlund also discusses the location of ritual sites in relation to divine will (30-36, 126) and the practice of augury (127).

date or coincide with the development of 'powerful cities', may indicate the existence of communities or individuals who are unconnected with, or possibly rival the practices and developments in the future urban centres. The destruction and or discontinued use of many ritual structures in Etruria in various types of locations from settlement centres to countryside, suggest that control, maintenance and usage of these structures was not a given promise between a settlement's community and the ritual structures in the vicinity. Edlund also states that 'the location, form, and appearance of the sanctuary are ultimately subordinate to its function as a sacred place which has entered into the structure of a society formed by man but governed by the divine' (Edlund 1987: 140). While I agree that many of the ritual structures integrate multiple functions, the sacred functions are likely to be perceived as predominant over the other functions. It should not be forgotten, however, that the importance and survival of these structures depended on the will of people. A connection with the divine did not make ritual structures immune to the effects of social change, and instead is probably one of the biggest indicators of social change.

Riva and Stoddart (1996) suggest that funerary, settlement and ritual contexts should be integrated together to understand the Etruscan landscape. They criticise Colonna (1985a) and Edlund (1983, 1987) for neglecting the symbolic and ritualised qualities of the landscape, with their emphasis on spatial, rather than ritual definitions. They do, however, agree with Edlund that rural sanctuaries were used and managed by local rural communities, and extra-urban sanctuaries and *emporia* were controlled by cities. Riva and Stoddart focus on the transformation of liminal spaces, such as boundaries of cities, territories and the Etruscan civilisation, as a whole, into ritualised zone. They see the monumentalisation of sanctuaries and tombs in these liminal zones as a means of ritualising, and thereby easing the tensions in the contested or politically uncertain areas (Riva and Stoddart 1996: 93, 99; see Snodgrass 1980 and Morris 1987 for discussion of parallel developments in Greece). Tombs and funerary architecture ritualised the boundaries between territories through political and ideological means with 'private and socially exclusive' structures; sanctuaries, on the other hand, were public structures and symbolised a 'larger social reality' (Riva and Stoddart 1996: 94). The *emporia*, in particular, were sanctuaries with an added

economic function, providing secure areas for trade between Etruscans, Greeks and Phoenicians (Riva and Stoddart 1996: 92-99, 105-106).

Riva and Stoddart offer a more complex view integrating ritual and practical social needs to the picture. The placement of sanctuaries and tombs does more than merely define the communities who are in some way connected to them; they are a part of the ideology behind the development of each settlement, creating unique identities for each settlement and, possibly, the Etruscans as a whole. The sanctuaries and tombs differ, however, in their function. Sanctuaries, particularly *emporia*, can become a unifying structure like a bridge between communities and cultures, while the tombs are more divisive, like a physical barrier marking more restricted areas. A neglected area of their study is perhaps the chronology of the sanctuaries; the date, form and decoration of the sanctuaries may also provide insight into the handling of liminal areas when considered together. As with regard to Edlund's work, I would reiterate that control over the sanctuaries may not be such a simple matter, and that more detailed investigation into the similarities and differences of sanctuaries of similar ages across the region is needed; there are probably both spatial and chronological differences.

3. FORM AND DECORATION OF RITUAL STRUCTURES

In this section, the physical form and decoration of ritual structures is investigated. Vedia Izzet explores the uniqueness of forms for Etruscan ritual structures, but emphasises how basic architectural elements are crucial to understanding the development of formalised ritual space. Arvid Andrén was the first to deal directly with the architectural decorations from formal ritual structures. Timothy Gantz explores issues involved in interpreting one particular type of architectural decoration, the 'seated assembly' frieze plaques, approaching them on symbolic and stylistic bases. This leads into a discussion of these frieze plaques and their role in interpreting Etruscan power.

Izzet (2000) looks specifically at temple decorations to explore the symbolic meanings inherent in the structures. She concentrates on temples from the second

half of the sixth century, when structures identifiable with primarily or solely ritual functions begin to be constructed (Izzet 2000: 37; Izzet 2001; see also Glinister 2003). Izzet investigates the cultural understandings involved in Etruscan temple architecture and decoration, rather than focusing on art historical, architectural history, socio-political, intra-site and regional development aspects (Izzet 2000: 37-39; cf Colonna 1985, Pallottino 1991, Rendeli 1993, Riva and Stoddart 1996, Spivey 1997, Torelli 1990, Zifferero 1995). These other approaches, she argues, concentrate on marking differences, such as between art forms, or on removing the sanctuaries from their contexts (Izzet 2000: 39).

Several specific elements are therefore chosen by Izzet to illustrate the development of the Etruscan temple as an architectural form. She argues that form and location of decorations, such as temple bases, columns, frieze plaques, antefixes, ridgepole statues and pediment statues are used as a means of communicating messages to visitors and viewers of the temples. The decorations function partly as a guide around and into the temple, and partly as a means of elaborating and making distinct the parts of the temple. She then considers these elements in a larger context. She states that the decorations act as a join 'between floor and ground, wall and roof, and roof and sky' (Izzet 2000: 48). She also states that 'all the elements of the temple are unified in expressing the difference of the sacred from the profane, and thus ordering the relationship between the two' (Izzet 2000: 52). The monumentalisation of temples is partly related to the development of city-states and neighbouring territories; however, Izzet emphasises that the form and decoration of these structures were deliberately chosen to express difference between contrasting categories of being, such as religious and non-religious, and to mark the boundary between the space inside and outside of the temple (Izzet 2000: 46-48, 52, 53).

The work of Izzet is important because it focuses on what most of the other sources neglect, that is, the specific elements of which the temple structures are composed. Rather than focusing on their locations, on changes in their form, or on the artistic developments behind their decorations, Izzet is concerned with the cultural meaning attached to and surrounding the temples. The significance of these decorative elements does not primarily lie in their artistic relationship with Greek and Oriental

art, but in what they signified to the Etruscan viewer. Added to this, I would argue that it is also necessary to address who was behind the construction and decoration of the temples. The people responsible, be it an individual, group, or an entire community, were communicating particular things about themselves through these structures and their decorations. The stark contrasts in the themes of the decorations and the forms of the temples, compared to the earlier monumental complexes suggest that very different messages were being communicated. It would be relevant and interesting to know why these changes occurred.

3.1 A CLOSER LOOK AT ARCHITECTURAL DECORATIONS

Andrén produced a monumental work describing and photographing architectural terracottas from a multitude of temples in central Italy (1940). This has been used as the basis for many of the other works related to specific architectural terracottas. Because of the presumed nature of much of the material and the early date of the work, Andrén discusses the associated structures in terms of temples, although many of the structures in question are now seen to require more interpretation (for example, Damgaard Anderson 1993). Andrén relies on the description of the Roman architect, Vitruvius, for the form of the ‘Tuscan temple’ (Andrén 1940: XXXV); that is, a temple consisting of a central *cella* and two *alae* (see also B.1 of this chapter), which are believed to relate to the worship of a single divinity, possibly related to the tripartite shrines of the Minoan-Mycenaean world (Andrén 1940: XXXVI; see Ducati 1923 for the Minoan-Mycenaean reference). To this category, Andrén adds temples with one *cella* and no *alae* of oblong form, usually colonnaded on at least three sides, to create the term ‘Etrusco-Italic’ temple. Andrén delves deep into the origins of terracotta decorations, citing parts of Asia Minor and Aegean islands as possible birthplaces for this form of art, including Pazarli in Phrygia (dating as early as the eighth to seventh century BC), Ak-Alan and Larisa on Hermos as amongst the earliest (Andrén 1940: LXXXIV, citing Picard 1939: 205-211, fig. 8; Kjellberg 1940: 64-80). His Etrusco-Italic terracottas are divided into three periods, the first from the late seventh to second half of the sixth century BC, the second from the second half of the sixth century to the late fifth century, and the third from the late fifth to the late first century BC. He believes that the first period of terracotta production in Italy was carried out by local schools of native artists and craftsmen influenced by Greek

prototypes, who developed their own artistic style to alter and adapt the techniques to suit Etrusco-Italic architecture. Andrén states,

‘they developed an indigenous tradition of craftsmanship and created a system of fictile architectonic decoration which, though wholly composed of elements borrowed from the rich array of Greek art, was yet entirely different from the systems of the Hellenic world and to a certain degree has the character of a novel achievement’ (Andrén 1940: CLI).

The earliest terracotta decorations are low-relief square or rectangular figured frieze plaques from central Italy, dating to the late seventh century BC, the earliest examples of which are from Vignanello and Rome. It was in Etruria, however, that Andrén believes, special workshops developed: at Veii and Caere, and possibly another at Tuscania or Poggio Buco, where friezes and antefixes indicate distinct characteristics. Andrén’s discovery of fragments of five different figured frieze plaque scenes at Veii, Rome and Velletri is particularly intriguing (hereafter referred to as the VRV plaques) (Figure II.4). This pattern was later confirmed by Enrico Stefani’s discovery of a fragment of a sixth scene, the renowned ‘seated assembly’ scene, in the Portonaccio area of Veii, which matched the same scene found in Velletri (discussed at greater length below) (Stefani 1953: 57, fig. 32). At the time of publication, Andrén knew fragments of the two processions, chariot race, horseriding and banqueting scenes had been found at Veii, Rome and Velletri. Andrén shows that the VRV plaques are identical and made from moulds. It is Andrén’s belief that these terracottas were made in Veii and distributed to the other sites. He cites Pliny’s account of Rome summoning the Veientine artist, Vulca, to decorate the Capitoline temple with a statue of Jupiter for Tarquinius Priscus (whose reign is traditionally dated 616-578 BC) as support of a Veientine school being highly regarded (Andrén 1940: CXIX, also LXXII and CL. See Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 35, 45; Livy, 1. 56.1).

During the first period, the chief motifs are categorised by Andrén as: animals, horsemen, chariot races, processions of horses and chariots, banqueting scenes and assemblies of deities. Andrén states that only the frieze plaques of a seated group of figures, from Velletri and another of unknown provenance, which are interpreted by him as an assembly of deities, relate directly to the religious sphere (Andrén 1940: CXXX; and Van Buren 1921: 70). This is now, however, highly debated and will be

discussed in section B.4 of this chapter (another fragment of this scene was also found at Veii, and can be added to the list (Stefani 1953: 57, fig 32). Andrén proposes that many of the motifs were taken from Greek art, solely for decorative purposes, to which no religious significance was attached (Andrén 1940: CXXXIII). Similarly, he also states that the only supernatural elements found in the frieze plaques are seated assembly scene with deities, and one of the procession scenes from the VRV series, depicting a male figure with a *petasus* and *caduceus*, identified as *Turms-Mercurius*, possibly leading a procession of dead heroes, as well as winged horses. In contrast, Andrén suggests that simae from the Latin site, Palestrina, depicting winged horses and a male figure with a *petasus* and *lituus*, but wearing soldier's greaves, is a 'thoughtless contamination of the two motives' (Figure II.2) (Andrén 1940: CXXXII-CXXXIII).

For Andrén the symbols used within this art form, which he so willingly labels as a unique Italian development, were blindly juxtaposed for aesthetic purposes. While Andrén's work on central Italian terracotta decorations is an enormous contribution to the study of the related cultures, some of his value-laden comments are a product of the time it was written. He does much to support the ideas, new at the time, regarding independent and skilled production of terracottas, as well as the development of architecture in pre-Roman Italy, although he largely subscribes to the view that Greek art was the pinnacle of art in the Mediterranean during this period. The 'borrowing' of symbols, motifs and elements was seen as symptomatic of this. These ideas are, of course, no longer universally accepted (Gantz 1975: 7). The assumption that no religious associations existed in the figured scenes for the Italian artists or viewers, is also outdated. The use of meaningful symbols and iconographic items in terracotta decorations found on monumental structures, which are also found in other cultures, is no coincidence or oversight. 'Mixing' motifs not found in Greek contexts is surely not a mistake, but rather a different use of them for a specific Italian context. Access to more recent excavation reports of structures with terracotta decorations, unavailable to Andrén, gives a very different picture. Fortunately, there is now the opportunity for combining up-to-date information concerning settlement, funerary, ritual contexts with the terracotta findings for a better understanding of the messages carried within the terracotta decorations and the structures they adorned.

With additional findings, we may get closer to the truth concerning one of Andrén's other concerns, that is, finding the origin of the identical frieze plaques at Veii, Rome and Velletri. Andrén believes that Veii was the artistic and production centre of this particular series because of allusion by classical authors to the esteemed workshop in Veii. It is interesting to note that the fragments from Veii and Rome were found in more than one location, while those from Velletri are associated with one temple structure. The discovery of more frieze plaque fragments in Veii has made the phenomenon clearer (see Chapter IV.B). The key may be to take a closer look at the development of these sites, with a more detailed chronology, and the specific structures in question to ascertain where these frieze plaques came from, and more importantly, why they were shared between these three settlements.

The work of Gantz (1975) has also illuminated the possible processes at work between the three sites, resulting in the distribution of the frieze plaques. He also argues for Veii as the origin of the six frieze plaque scenes. Gantz feels strongly that the workshop of Vulca, the famous Etruscan sculptor, made the friezes for the Portonaccio temple at Veii, giving them a probable date of 520 to 500 (Gantz 1975: 7). This resulted in the workshop of Vulca being commissioned for the work on the Capitoline temple in Rome, which was dedicated during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus (traditionally 616-578 BC), according to Pliny (*Nat. hist.* 35, 157). According to Gantz, the Romans would also have bought a set of the frieze plaque moulds to replace broken or worn plaques in the future. The moulds were then shared with four other temples in Rome (such as the temple of Saturn at the Comitium site and the S. Omobono temple). Then the Romans defeated the Volsci in 494 BC and took the city of Velletri and made it a Roman colony, which was later enlarged (Livy, 2.30-34). During this period, according to Gantz, the Romans would have built a grand temple in approximately 490 BC, presenting the opportunity for decorating it with the same fashionable frieze plaques found in Rome.

Gantz presents an interesting case for the production and distribution of the VRV plaques. It is problematic, however, to conceive of Rome as acting as a single entity. The distribution of the plaques may be much more complicated due to the findings of

plaque fragments at several locations in Rome. Only the chariot race and horseriding scenes have been found at the Capitoline temple site (Gantz 1975: 3; Gjerstad 1960: 203, fig. 127: 5, 7). The frieze plaques have also been found at several locations in Veii, and recently in Tarquinia (see Chapter IV.B). The development of the settlements and the structures in question needs to be investigated to get a more accurate view of the processes at work.

4. THE 'SEATED ASSEMBLY' FRIEZE PLAQUES

The interpretation of the 'seated assembly' scene on the frieze plaques from Velletri as an 'assembly of deities' has sparked much controversy over the years, particularly with the additional findings of a different 'seated assembly' scene on frieze plaques from Murlo (Figure II.5) (for Velletri, see Andr  n 1940: CXXX. for Murlo, see Phillips 1993). The 'seated assembly' frieze plaques have been singled out for discussion because of the wildly differing opinions of their meanings. It is argued here, however, that the meanings inherent in the frieze plaques is deeply rooted in the wider contexts of the structures that bore them, and the social structures present. Caution must be used before making assumptions about the symbolic nature of the imagery. While the Volscian site of Velletri is not one of the central sites of my project, the interpretation of some of the temple material recovered there relates directly to the interpretation of fragments of exact copies of the frieze plaque at Veii, and the similar frieze plaque and monumental complex at Murlo, as well as indirectly to the organisation of pre-Roman societies during this period. Many have used the seated assembly scene frieze plaques from one or both of these sites to argue that they indicate different forms of social, ritual and political organisation were present at these sites.

Many compositional similarities can be seen in the 'seated assembly' scenes from Velletri and Murlo. The Velletri 'seated assembly' frieze plaque (Figure II.5, as before) depicts two standing figures facing to the right. The first from the left edge is a woman, the second is a man holding a bow. They face six male figures seated on *curule* stools facing to the left. *Curule* stools are often attributed to the Etruscans, and were later adopted by the Romans as a stool for high-ranking individuals (Livy, 1.8).

The first male figure is a bearded man holding a staff; the second is a man holding a *lituus* or curved staff who has turned to face the next figure; the third wears a cap and sits with his chin in his hand; the fourth is a bearded man holding a staff; the fifth also turns to face the next figure (similar to the second seated figure) and holds a *lituus* or curved staff, the sixth figure has an arm outstretched with an open hand. The Murlo 'seated assembly' frieze plaque, dating to 610-530 BC (Figure II.5), depicts a group of individuals seated and standing all facing the right (Gantz 1971: 8). The first from the right edge is a bearded man seated with an elaborate footstool, holding a *lituus* or curved staff. The gender of the second figure who stands holding a sword in the left hand and a spear in the right hand is uncertain. The third figure is a woman seated in an elaborate throne or 'trono' with a slightly different footstool; she holds something in her right hand, possibly fruit on a branch or a flower (Gantz 1971: 6), and holds her mantle outstretched with her left hand. The fourth figure is a standing woman holding a fan and *situla* or bag. The fifth, sixth and seventh figures are all seated on similar *curule* stools with less elaborate footstools. The genders of the fifth and seventh figures are uncertain, and they both hold an item that appears to be a flower- or fruit-bearing branch. The sixth figure is a bearded man holding a double-headed axe. The eighth is a standing possibly male figure holding a staff with a two-pronged end.

4.1 THE FRIEZE PLAQUES AS DEPICTIONS OF DEITIES

Åkerström has proposed that the Velletri scene depicts the introduction of Heracles into Olympus. He identifies the standing figures as Athena and Heracles, and the first seated figure as Zeus, the second as an unidentified female goddess and the third as Hermes. The second group of three seated figures has not been identified (Åkerström 1954). Åkerström, however, is unable to explain why Athena is much smaller than the other gods, why Heracles holds a bow, rather than a more readily identifiable symbol such as a club or lion's mantle. Also, the inability to identify the last three figures shows that the full meaning of the scene is not understood, under this scheme.

Gantz also argues that the 'seated assembly' scenes from Velletri and Murlo depict gods (Gantz 1971; 1975; see also Butterworth and Gantz 1970: 55-57). He cites the views of Åkerström, but suggests that the artist of the Velletri plaque intended to create an assembly of anonymous gods (Gantz 1971: 8). His main aim, however, is to

identify the hand-held objects in the Murlo plaque as divine attributes, used to identify specific gods. The *lituus* is used to identify the first figure as Zeus. Although Gantz admits that the *lituus* is usually used as the marker of augurs, he cites a bronze statuette holding a *lituus* from the Zeus sanctuary on Mount Lykaion and usually identified as Zeus, as well as a black figure vase from Caere, both of which are dated to the second half of the sixth century, depicting a possible Zeus figure holding a crooked stick with an owl attached. The sword and spear are then used to identify the second figure as Athena, attending to Zeus. The elaborate throne and cloak are used to identify the third figure as Hera. This can then be seen as a divine triad, the Capitoline triad in particular. Because the fourth figure holds no easily identifiable divine attribute, but merely a *cista* and a fan, Gantz labels her as Hera's servant, possibly Iris, Hebe, or an unknown Etruscan deity. Gantz then suggests that the fifth, sixth and seventh figures are either not divine or should be identified as a second, or Aventine, triad of gods, possibly Demeter, Dionysos and Persephone (Gantz 1971: 21). He acknowledges that their attributes of *fascēs* and (what he identifies as) pomegranates are found in Etruscan funerary contexts, and consequently concludes that a non-divine identification of the trio would mean identifying them as deceased. It is the double-headed axe which identifies Dionysos, according to Gantz, although he admits that there are many images of the Hephaistos and the later Etruscan god Charun with double axes, making the identification more problematic (Gantz 1971: 14-17). The eighth figure is identified either as Hermes, because of the *caduceus*-like staff he bears, or a 'generalised type of divine servant' (Gantz 1971: 23).

There are several problems with Gantz's interpretation. First, Gantz's idea that the 'seated assembly' scene found in Velletri (and Veii) represents anonymous gods seems outlandish, since it would serve no immediate purpose to the structures it adorned, or to anything else. In addition, the plaque was probably commissioned and designed, to some extent, to please the desire of those responsible for the construction of the structures. The interpretations of the Murlo plaque are overstretched to the point of desperation. While both of the items used to associate Zeus with the *lituus* may be depictions of Zeus, they were both created in Greece, which must be acknowledged as quite a different context. It should be noted, however, that the vast majority of images or statues of male figures holding *litui* or curved staffs come from

central Italian contexts, and are interpreted as augurs (see Chapter VI for a discussion). The interpretation of Athena is unconvincing due to her lowly position standing between the two grand thrones, and because it is not possible to say with any certainty that this figure is even female (although Torelli agrees that the figure is female 1983: 480). The identification of Hera is stronger; however, there are many images of other female figures wearing cloaks over their heads (Gantz 1971: 11; Ducati 1932: pl. 1-2; Beazley 1956: 89, no. 2). The fourth figure seems clearly to be an attendant, not of special or divine rank, which is particularly interesting given the absence of other images depicting gods with servants. As for the identification of Dionysos, the fact that more than one god, as well as the mythical figure Cassandra (Steuernagel 1998: fig 115, 118, 122, 128, 301, 304), is associated with the double-axe make this identification questionable. In fact, numerous double-headed axes have been found in funerary contexts from this period across central, and other parts of Italy (see Chapter VI for a discussion). The identification of Demeter and Persephone, based on the possible pomegranates, is also problematic. The fruit is indeed often associated with Persephone; however, the pomegranate is also associated with other fertility goddesses and Astarte, as well as being a common motif on female Hellenistic funerary urns. It is particularly problematic if the 'Hera' figure is also seen to be holding a pomegranate. Also, if one considers the Latin name for the fruit *malum punicum* (Der Neue Pauly, 'Granatapfel'; for ancient sources see Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 13.112-113; 15.39; 17.65-67; 23.110), it indicates that the pomegranate was also associated with Carthaginians, who introduced the fruit across southern Europe. The flowers were also considered to have healing properties (Der Neue Pauly, 'Granatapfel'). An ivory sculpture laminated with gold, very similar in appearance to the fruits in the frieze plaque, was found in the Montetosto tumulus outside Caere, dating to the second half of the seventh century BC. It is believed to be a plectrum, suggesting the grand importance of music in elite contexts during this period (*Principi Etruschi* 2001: 244, no. 285; see Chapter VI). But again, these two figures cannot be identified as being female with any certainty because their hairstyles, bodies and clothing are not particularly distinct from the other figures identified by Gantz as being male. The definite female figures in the scene are demarcated as such with 'trono'-type seats like the second figure, or with belts like the fourth figure.

Torelli (1983) also argues for a divine interpretation in his discussion of how the fictile decorations at Murlo, and other palazzi, relate to the religious ideology expressed through the structures (Torelli 1983: esp. 479-482). He states that the themes of symposium, competition and marriage were central to aristocratic life, and were therefore chosen to decorate the structures. Instead, he suggests that a *theôn agora*, or meeting of gods, is depicted in the 'seated assembly' scene, in which the divine couple, depicted in grandeur, are juxtaposed with inferior divinities and one attendant (Torelli 1983: 481). The assembly of gods depicted, according to Torelli, idealises the aristocratic *oikos* of the dominant class. In this way, for Torelli, the importance of the house and the ancestors of the aristocrats were combined in a meaningful way.

4.2 THE FRIEZE PLAQUES AS DEPICTIONS OF MORTALS

Mazzarino was one of the first to comment on the 'seated assembly' frieze plaque from Velletri, and to argue against Andr  n (Mazzarino 1945: 67-80). He states that the scene depicts one of public life, not of gods (Mazzarino 1945: 68 (una scena di vita pubblica, e non gi   a figurazione di dei)). The two figures holding *litui* are consequently identified as 'sacerdoti-magistrati', and not just augurs. He also addresses the problem of two of the symbols being used twice within the Velletri plaque. If a *lituus* signifies a god, such as Vertumnus, then two figures holding *litui* are problematic, just as with the first and fourth figure who are both bearded men holding staffs. Mazzarino, on the other hand, acknowledges that this duplication is possible as in the blurred identification of Vertumnus and Tinia in Volsinii with one attribute used to identify both divinities, although it is unlikely that the both divinities would appear in the same image because of their overlapping identities (Mazzarino 1945: 71; Pettazzoni 1928: 207; Clemen 1936: 97-98). He goes on, however, to suggest that in this 'magistratura collegiale', the figures, particularly the first three seated figures, are placed in order of importance to signify relative rank (Mazzarino 1945: 72). The frieze at Velletri and the group of *cippi* from Chiusi with 'seated assembly' scenes, he believes, illustrate a constitutional evolution for the Etruscans during the second half of the sixth century BC, which may have stemmed from the idea of the 'consiglio di familia', or family council (Mazzarino 1945: 78).

Mauro Cristofani proposes a different interpretation (Cristofani 1975: 13). He states that the figures in the the Murlo 'seated assembly' frieze plaque represented a 'signore-guerriero' with his wife and the rest of his family behind him. Cristofani states that every detail, piece of furnishing and every symbol at the Murlo structure was utilised to reflect the social status of the residents within. For him, the decorations demonstrate that ideology, influenced by the Greek world, was used by the aristocrats to represent and legitimise their positions. The later destruction of the monumental complexes occurred during a period of political expansion for the major Etruscan centres out into the more sparsely populated territories of the minor centres (Cristofani 1975: 12, 15).

Thuillier also argues for a mortal interpretation of the 'seated assembly' scene at Murlo (Thuillier 1980). In contrast to the other works, however, Thuillier believes that athletics, games and contests are at the heart of Etruscan aristocratic life, and that the frieze plaques at Murlo are intimately related to this. For Thuillier, the 'seated assembly' scene is one of elites and their attendants acting as spectators of games, horse-riding in particular (Thuillier 1980: 388; for *cippi* from Palermo depicting horseracing, see Paribeni 1938: 118, pl. 28.2). The accompanying attributes of the figures are then seen as aristocratic items with parallels in funerary contexts across the region. The figure holding the *lituus*, is interpreted as an important figure with religious duties. The *lituus* is the identifying symbol of this status in general; however the symbol works on different levels, and in this context the *lituus* is being used to identify the figure as an umpire of the games (Thuillier 1980: 388-392; the Tomb of the Augurs is cited as an example of this phenomenon in Tarquinia). Thuillier identifies the second figure (identified by Gantz 1971 as Athena), as a possible male figure, similar to those shown on *stelae* from Volterra and Fiesole (Thuillier 1980: 385; for the *stelae* from Volterra and Fiesole see Torelli 2001: 615, no 249, and 564, no. 76). The third figure is interpreted as a matron, rather than a goddess, such as Hera (Thuillier 1980: 392; see the Tomb of the Sphinx from Chiusi for an image of a matron (Steingr ber 1985: 274). Likewise, the figures holding pomegranates or flowers are not viewed as goddesses. He rightly comments that one of the reclining figures on the 'banqueting' scene also holds a similar object, but has

never been suggested to be divine (Figure II.4). He cites other contexts depicting figures holding flower-like objects, including a *stèle* from Fiesole (Thuillier 1980: 386; for the *stèle* from Fiesole with a female figure, see Magi 1932: pl. 1, 2). The figure holding the double-axe is interpreted as an elite warrior, rather than a god, such as Dionysos, and Thuillier cites the *stèle* from Vetulonia as evidence of this symbol relating to elite Etruscan life (Thuillier 1980: 386; for the *stèle* from Vetulonia of *Avele Feluske*, see *PE* 227).

I am not convinced of the athletic emphasis in Thuillier's interpretation of the 'seated assembly' scene at Murlo. While I find this reading too specific and narrow, I believe he is right to view the scene as one depicting an aspect of elite life. Thuillier also points out many important problems with the divine interpretation. The symbols used within this scene, interpreted by others as divine attributes, are found in other types of contexts across Etruria which are specifically connected to the identification of individuals, such as funerary *stelae*. He also rightly puts this scene back in the context of the other Murlo frieze plaques which are not interpreted as depicting deities, but show figures who are seen with some of the same symbols.

Bruun develops an extensive argument for interpreting the 'seated assembly' plaques from Velletri and Murlo as aristocrats (Bruun 1993). For the Velletri plaque, Bruun argues that the two small figures on the left are not the most important in the scene, and it may even be 'read' from right to left because of the Etruscan language also reading from right to left (Bruun 1993: 268-269; Small 1987: 125-135 is cited for views on the right to left directional reading of Etruscan art). Central to Bruun's reasoning are, first, a reconfiguring of Heracles' role in central Italian art during the seventh and sixth centuries BC, and second, his scepticism of frequent attempts to identify this figure in Etruscan iconography. The motif of the 'introduction of Heracles to Olympus' is argued to have been used by the tyrants of this period in Athens to legitimate their own political hegemony, particularly in black figure vase painting (Boardman 1972: 1, 57-72; Boardman 1975: 1-12). This has been adopted for Etruscan and Latin contexts to explain findings of possible statues of Heracles and Athena/Minerva in the Area Sacra di San Omobono in Rome and the Portonaccio temple at Veii, the identifications of which are debated (Cristofani 1981: 194, no 20;

Coarelli 1981: 201; Colonna 1987: 19). Bruun states, however, that the bow and arrow was a common motif in Etruscan art, not often associated with Heracles, but usually with hunting and warfare scenes (Bruun 1993: 273-374). The inclusion of *curule* stools in the 'seated assembly' plaques from Murlo (Phillips 1993: 38-44), Velletri and a fragment of a frieze from Acquarossa (Wikander 1981: 55, fig 30, no 76), as well as numerous stamped friezes of *bucchero* vases (Scalia 1968: 358-401), indicate to Bruun that the seats suggest a common element in Etruscan art spanning a long period and across the region (Bruun 1993: 272; Schäfer 1989: 33-36, who states that the figures are 'referees' for public games or magistrates).

Like Thuillier, Bruun rightly states that the 'seated assembly' scene at Velletri must be considered alongside the other five frieze plaque scenes from the VRV series, which are not interpreted as depicting divine scenes. Consequently, the 'seated assembly' scene provides the only element of aristocratic lifestyle missing from the series, that 'of ruling, of judging, of leading the community' (Bruun 1993: 275, also citing D'Agostino 1989: 1-10). The figures in the scene, then, represent the ruling aristocracy meeting with two of their subjects.

Bruun discusses many interesting points. The attempts of others to view iconography in Etruria, particularly images of Heracles, from a Greek viewpoint are inappropriate. The religious and political significance of symbols in different contexts across the Mediterranean cannot be viewed as homogenous. As he states, many of the symbols found in the frieze plaques are found on numerous types of objects across the region, suggesting how the meanings behind the symbols developed in Etruria. Most importantly, Bruun suggests that the 'seated assembly' scene frieze plaque cannot be viewed in isolation from the other plaques in the series. I would add to that that the structures they adorned and the settlements as wholes need to be integrated into the investigation.

4.3 FRIEZE PLAQUE CONCLUSIONS

The frieze plaques have been investigated from several different perspectives. In agreement with Mazzarino, Cristofani, Thuillier and Bruun, I believe that the 'seated assembly' scene frieze plaques depict one aspect of aristocratic lifestyle; more

specifically I would claim that they deal with the distribution of power amongst the elites. This theme fits with the general theme of the frieze plaques, illustrating different scenes of aristocratic life, such as banquetting, horse-riding and marching (perhaps to battle). The inclusion of symbols often attributed to gods sent a very clear message to viewers (elites or non-elites) of the frieze plaque expressing the elevated statuses of elite individuals, or elites in general. The elites borrowed and altered a language of symbols for their own purposes. In fact, the continued use of particular symbols as divine attributes elsewhere, particularly depictions of deities on vases, suggests that the differences and similarities between the deities and elites was a long term dialectic. It is also critical to consider the wider context of these scenes. The structures adorned by the frieze plaques may have been primarily palaces, possibly with more pictorial emphasis on the aristocratic lifestyle than the ritual functions. The frieze plaques will be discussed in relation to these structures and the development of the settlements in Chapter V.

C. APPROACHES TO ETRUSCAN POWER BASED ON LINGUISTIC MATERIAL

There are many layers involved in interpreting Etruscan culture, particularly when discussing types of authority. The most prevalent type of data is material culture, which will be discussed in Chapters V, VI and VII. There is also a collection of terms from epigraphic and literary sources, which are commonly referred to as evidence for particular statuses. These are Etruscan, Greek, Latin and Phoenician terms which were arguably used in antiquity, as they are in modern scholarship to describe Etruscan titles, offices and duties. These interpretations, however, are problematic.

First, the sources themselves present a number of difficulties. Most of the Etruscan terms date to a much later period than the one under study here, the earliest of them originating in the fifth century BC; the majority, however, date to the third century BC. The Latin terms used to refer to Etruscan society (either in antiquity or by modern scholars), are probably inappropriate in Etruscan contexts. Three of the main Latin sources, Livy (who wrote in the late first century BC), and Servius and

Macrobius, who wrote in the fourth century AD, probably had little idea of the political workings of Etruria during the sixth century BC, or Rome for that matter; and yet they are often cited as doing so. Bilingual inscriptions are argued to be the key to decoding the Etruscan language; however, they still leave the full definitions of many important terms unclear. Often the Latin, Greek or Phoenician terms are not fully understood in their own right, and in the cases of bilingual inscriptions it is difficult to say that these terms and their Etruscan counterparts are exact equivalents. Many of the Etruscan terms are from the funerary sphere, and relate to the titles and duties of the deceased. The meanings of the majority of titles are still unclear, and are often defined as ‘magistrate’, such as *camthi*, *checase*, *celu* and *creal*, which may give an inaccurate impression of the political systems present. In addition, the small number of instances of these terms suggests that they may not apply uniformly to Etruscan settlements across the region.

This short section is presented here, rather than as part of the glossary, because it is necessary to discuss how these terms have been used in presenting Etruscan society. There is an established tradition whereby the Etruscan language is discussed as a solved mystery, used to explain *the* Etruscan culture, often regardless of time period or possible regional differences. A linguistic approach is not used here, but its existence will be discussed, because of its problematic nature. Definitions of Etruscan terms are often supplied in an uncritical way, and give the impression that their meanings are secure. The sources, however, are not discussed critically, and the actual inscriptions from which the terms come are not usually mentioned. The Corpora of inscriptions (*TLE*, *CIE*), although helpful, do not give much contextual information such as approximate dates, which are consequently not supplied in the works that discuss the inscriptions, nor are the original excavation reports cited. The data are not made easily accessible, the result of which is that the casual reader of these works is often misled, and not given the tools to look more critically.

This section discusses a number of these debatable terms, and is organised by language, in this order: Etruscan, Phoenician, Latin and Greek. Some of the terms are discussed only briefly due to a lack of more information. Examples of inscriptions, where possible, are listed in bullet points.

Etruscan Terms:

The Etruscan terms are difficult to assess, mainly due to our poor understanding of the language.

aprinthvale

Inscription

Title of priest or *apa*, father- (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 214). This term is obviously not well understood.

- Sarcophagus from Tarquinia (*TLE* 131).

calatur (Etruscan)/ calator (Latin)

Inscription

- A *bucchero* sherd found in the 'monumental complex' of Vigna Parocchiale at Caere, dated to the mid-sixth century BC, was found inscribed with the phrase *calaturus mi* (Figure II.6). The excavator argues that it means 'araldo' or herald, *rex*, or king in English (Cristofani 1997: 51; Moretti Sgubini 2001: 121, fig II.A.2.15).

camilli

Inscription

This term has been defined as a group of Etruscan 'priests', and an equivalent to the Greek term *kadmiloi* (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 187).

- *TLE* 819a, glosses (Dion. Hal., 2.22.2; Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.8.6; Servius, *ad Aen.* 11.543)

camthi

Inscription

Title of magistracy, censor (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 111, 215).

- Sarcophagus from Tarquinia (*TLE* 145).

cechase

Inscription

Title of magistracy (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 215).

- Tomb inscription from Tarquinia (*TLE* 101).

celu

Inscription

Title of magistracy (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 215). This term has only been found once, and the definition is not secure.

- This term is listed twice on the Capua tile (*TLE* 2).

creal

Inscription

This seems to be the title of a political office. It is often referred to as the title of a magistrate (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 215).

- Sarcophagus of the Magistrate, from Tarquinia, dated to the second half of the third century BC (Figure II.7) (*TLE* 131; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 149).

lauchme (Etruscan)/lucomo (Latin)

Written sources and inscription.

This term is often referred to as an Etruscan term for ‘king’, as was stated by Servius. Two inscriptions are also believed to support this; however, their definition is based on Servius being correct. Also inherent in this is the idea that kingly and priestly roles overlapped. It has also been defined as ‘consul’ (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 111). Whether or not this term is correctly interpreted as ‘king’ or ‘consul’, still does not clarify the duties or nature of the position.

- Servius stated in fourth century AD, ‘...*lucomones, qui reges sunt lingua Tuscorum*’, or ‘the lucomones, who are the kings in the Etruscan language’ (Servius, *ad Aen.* 2.278) (*TLE* 843; *ET Glosses*; Scullard 1967: 221; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 190).
- The Zagreb mummy wrappings contained the term *lauchumneti*, interpreted as ‘in the priest’s house’ (Figure II.8). The text as a whole has been interpreted as a sacred calendar. (*TLE* 1; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 58; Pfiffig 1969: 244-250; Scullard 1967: 221).
- The Sarcophagus of the Magistrate, from Tarquinia, dated to the second half of the third century BC contained the term *lucairce*, is interpreted as a verb related to the function of the priest (*TLE* 131; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 149; Scullard 1967: 221).

The term *lucomo* is also mentioned as the name of one particular king. It is cited as the original Etruscan version of the name of Lucius Tarquinius Priscus, before moving to Rome. According to the same tradition, *Lucomo* was also the name of his father, who is described as a son of Demaratus (Livy, 1. 34; Dion. Hal., 3.48; Cristofani 1999: 160; Cornell 1985: 139).

maru (Etruscan)/ maro (Latin)

Inscription

This term is often regarded as a magistrate office with a priestly role (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 100). This is due to inscriptions from Musarna (*TLE* 170, 171, 175), Norchia, Orvieto, Tarquinia (*TLE* 134) and Tuscania (*TLE* 190; Lambrechts 1959: 108-114). The Umbrian equivalent, *maron*, is also found on the Iguvine tables (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 217). Owing to the late date of this evidence, it is unclear if this term existed during the Orientalising and Archaic periods.

- A sarcophagus from Tuscania with the inscription *maru pachathuras* or ‘the maru of Bacchus’ (*TLE* 190), attesting to priestly duties (Scullard 1967: 228).
- *maru* is also attested at Tarquinia on a sarcophagus (*TLE* 134; Scullard 1967: 230).

Scullard argues that *maru* is lower in rank than *zilath* (Scullard 1967: 228). Other inscriptions, however, illustrate that, *maru* is sometimes used as a qualifier of *zilath* (Cristofani 1999: 161). Two titles *maru* and *zilath* were found together on two separate sarcophagi from Musarna (*TLE* 170-171; Scullard 1967: 230, no. 158), although Scullard admits ignorance of the seventh and sixth centuries, because the

evidence is all from later periods (1967: 231). Cristofani argues that these are all collegial offices, the specifics of which are unclear (Cristofani 1999: 161).

Maru has also compared with the Latin term *aedile*, although Scullard is quick to add 'but the evidence is too complicated to allow so neat a solution' (Scullard 1967: 226-227). *Aediles* were magistrates, subordinate to the tribunes of the plebs, in charge of supervising the common temple and cults of the plebs (*OCD* third ed.). Cristofani likens the term to *quaestor*, which was the lowest regular magistracy, originally appointed by the king, which had judicial and military duties (Cristofani 1999: 161; *OCD* third ed.). There seems to be little reason to make the comparison between *maru* and either of these two Latin terms.

Scullard also argues that a *maru* is represented in the VRV 'seated assembly' scene frieze plaque, referring to the figure with the *lituus*, although it is not clear why he does so (1967: 230).

mastarna (Etruscan)/macstrna (Latin)

Tomb painting

This term has been interpreted as the Etruscanised version of *magister*, which may have become a synonym for 'leader', although Cornell describes this as 'a rather flimsy idea' (Cornell 1995: 139-140, 235).

- The term *macstrna* is painted above one of the figures in the wall paintings of the François Tomb at Vulci, dated to the fourth century BC (Figure II.9) (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 100, 112; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 171; Cornell 1995: 135-140; Buranelli 1987: 97).

The term *mastarna* is also cited as the original name of Servius Tullius before moving to Rome.

- This is according to a speech by the Emperor Claudius (*ILS* 212.I.8-27; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 200; Cornell 1995: 134-5, 137-141, 144-145, 157, 235). Cornell also suggests that the figure in the François Tomb may be identified as Servius Tullius (1995: 140).

netsvis

Inscription

The term is believed to mean *haruspex* in Etruscan (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 228; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 217).

- The bilingual (Etruscan and Latin) inscription in stone from Pesaro, illustrates the possible equivalents of the title in the two languages.

Etruscan: *cafates l(a)r(th) l(a)r(is) netsvis. trutnvt. frontac.*

Cafate Larth, son of Laris, haruspex, priest, interpreter of thunderbolts.

Latin: *L. Cafatius. L(uci) f(ilius) Ste(latina tribu) haruspex fulguriator.*

Lucius Cafatius, son of Lucius, of the Stellatina tribe, haruspex, interpreter of thunder bolts.

(*TLE* 697; *RE haruspices*; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 69; Benelli 1994: 13-15, no 1)

- The Sarcophagus of the Magistrate, from Tarquinia, dated to the second half of the third century BC contained the term *nethsrac*, which is interpreted as

describing the deceased as having written a book on haruspicy, or writing more generally (*TLE* 131; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 149-150).

parnich

Inscription

Title of magistracy or priesthood (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 218).

- The term is found on the Sarcophagus of the Magistrate, from Tarquinia, dated to the second half of the third century BC (*TLE* 131; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 149).

purth/purthne/purtsvana

Tomb painting, inscription

This term is defined as the title of a magistrate, magistracy, or dictator (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 111, 218). It has also been likened to the Latin term *quaestor* (Scullard 1967: 226; Lambrechts 1959: 115). The definition of this term is obviously not clear.

- The term is found in the tomb paintings of Tomb of the Orcus at Tarquinia, dated to the second half of the third century BC (*TLE* 87).
- Also on a sarcophagus from Sarteano (*TLE* 501)
- It is sometimes interpreted as a qualifier of *zilath*, e.g. as on a sarcophagus from Vulci (*TLE* 324; Cristofani 1999: 161).

tamera

Inscription

Title of magistracy (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 219).

- This term is found on a sarcophagus from Musarna (*TLE* 170, 172).
- Also on a sarcophagus from Tuscania (*TLE* 195).

trutnuth/trutnvt

Inscription

This term is defined as priest, and possibly more specifically, interpreter of thunderbolts (*fulguriator*) (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 219).

- This is based on the bilingual inscription from Pesaro. The term is associated with *frontac* (see above, under *netsvis* for the inscription) (*TLE* 697; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 69; Benelli 1994: 13-15, no. 1).

zilath/zilach, zilc

Inscription

This term is often defined as *rex*, *praetor*, or king, largely due to its presence on the Pyrgi tablets, as well as in the funerary inscriptions on elaborate sarcophagi (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 220; Cornell 1985: 232; Scullard 1967: 226-228). Scullard argues that the figures depicted in the VRV 'seated assembly' scene frieze plaque holding sceptres represent *zilaths*, although it is unclear why (1969: 230).

- The term is attested at Tarquinia (*TLE* 102, 137, 146), Musarna (*TLE* 169, 174) and Vetulonia (*TLE* 365).
- The Pyrgi tablets are gold *laminae* bearing a bilingual inscription (Punic and Etruscan), dated to c. 500 BC (Figure II.10) (*TLE* 873-876; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 58-59). They were found in a well between the two temples at the port site of Pyrgi, and are believed to have hung from the entranceway of Temple

B (Cornell 1985: 112). The laminae mention a person named Thefarie Velianas, as bearing the title of *zilath* in Etruscan and *melek* in Punic. Because the Punic word is often associated with the Latin terms *rex* or *praetor*, it has been asserted that *zilath* must also carry similar responsibilities and roles. The text also states that he held the office for three years (Cornell 1995: 232).

- The funerary inscription on the sarcophagus of Larth Tute from Vulci, states that he held the office of *zilath* seven times and *purth* once (*TLE* 324; Scullard 1967: 228). This indicates that it was an office of relatively short length, possibly annual, and was renewable many times. Another sarcophagus inscription from Vulci mentions a twenty-five year old man having held the office of *zilath*, indicating that young people were eligible (*TLE* 325; Scullard 1967: 228; Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 100).
- Also on another sarcophagus from Tuscania (*TLE* 194; Scullard 1967: 230).
- Many different types of *zilaths* with different combinations of terms are attested to in inscriptions, including *zilath parchis*, *zilath eterav*, *zilch cechaneri*, the responsibilities of which are not clear (Scullard 1967: 226-228; Cristofani 1999: 161). It has been suggested that it was the most important annual magistracy, possibly only open to elite minority (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 99-100, citing Lambrechts 1959: 94-96).
 - *zilath mechl rasnal* is mentioned on the Cortona Tablet, dated to the third or second century BC (Figure II.11). This has been interpreted as ‘magistrate of the people’ (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 181), as well as *praetor Etruriae* or the leader of League of Twelve Cities (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 90).
 - This term, *zilath mechl rasnal*, is also included in the wall paintings of the Tomb of the Orcus in Tarquinia, dated to the second half of the third century BC (*TLE* 87; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 106).
- The term *zilci* is associated with more magisterial rather than royal terms. It is found on the Cortona Tablet, which has been interpreted as ‘in the magistracy of...’ or ‘in the presidency of...’ (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 181; Watmough 2004: Cambridge Philological seminar, Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge).
 - The term *zilci* is found on the wall paintings of the Tomba degli Scudi at Tarquinia, dated to the fourth century BC, and is interpreted as praetorship (*TLE* 90, 91; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 171-172; Scullard 1967: 228).
 - The phrase *zilc cechaneri*, found on the Sarcophagus of the Magnate, from Tarquinia, dated to the third century BC, has been interpreted as *praetor* of sacred functions (*TLE* 126; Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 149).

Phoenician Term:

melek

Inscription

On the Pyrgi tablets, the Phoenician inscription describes Thefarie Velianas (TBRY’ WLNS) as the *melek* (MLK ‘L) of Caere, which has been interpreted as ‘king’ (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 66), or as the equivalent of the Latin term *praetor* (Cornell 1995: 232); although *praetor maximus* and *zilath* were also proposed (Pallottino 1964: 69, 97). This term is clearly not understood.

Latin Terms:

augur/augures

Written sources

Augurs were an important type of priest, whose main duties involved the observation of bird flight, and sometimes the significance of lightning. They have been defined as ‘official Roman diviners’ (*OCD* third ed.); however, they were important in both Etruria and Rome, but characterised by different methods. Etruscan specialists could interpret the significance of the omens they observed, while Roman augurs interpreted omens as a response to a pre-posed question (Dion. Hal., 3.70.5; Strabo, 17.c.8.13.43; Pfiffig 1975: 151). Augurs are associated with the *lituus* (Livy, 1. 18. 7; Cicero, *De div.* 1. 30). Romulus was the first augur in Rome, and based his knowledge on the Etruscan tradition (Cicero, *De nat. deor.* 2.4.10; Cicero, *De div.* 1.17.33, 1.30, 2.34. 74). It later became one of the four great colleges of priests (*OCD* third ed.). Cicero states that public augurs were one of the few groups of priests with knowledge of public and private sacrifices in Rome (Cicero, *De leg.* 2.8), and that the augur’s office was one of high dignity (Cicero, *De nat.* 2.4). The position of augur was also apparently an office that could be held for life, originally only by patricians, but eventually by both plebian and patrician individuals (Livy, 23. 21. 7; *OCD* third ed.).

haruspex/haruspices

Written sources

Haruspices were an important type of priest, whose main duties were interpreting the entrails of sacrificed animals and different types of lightning bolts. It is particularly associated with the Etruscans; of which the Etruscan *haruspices* were often called to Rome for their advice (Livy, 1.56.4; Cicero, *De nat. deor.* 2.12; *OCD* third ed.; Cornell 1995: 167; Wissowa 1912: 547; Fraccaro 1957: 61). They are also associated with the *apex* hat, the *lituus*, sacrificial knife and axe (Pfiffig 1975: 47).

Seneca mentions a book describing the details of Etruscan haruspicy, or the *Etrusca Disciplina*, written by a man named Caecina, which was consulted by many, including Pliny, but no longer exists (Seneca, *Nat. quest.* 2.39).

See the Etruscan term *netsvis*.

lictors/lictiores

Written sources

The *lictors* were attendants, believed to be Etruscan in origin, to the kings of Rome, and later to magistrates with *imperium*, who carried the *fascēs*, or bundles of rods and axes. The development of axes and *fascēs* is believed to originate with the Etruscans (*OCD* third ed.).

‘It was from them [the Etruscans] that were derived the *fascēs*, ... and in fact all the ornaments and insignia which serve the dignity of office’ (Florus, 1.1.5; also Livy, 1.8.2).

More specifically, *fascēs* are associated with Vetulonia. ‘From that city came the twelve bundles of rods that are born before the consul, and also the twelve axes with their silent menace’ (Silius Italicus, *Pun.* 8.483).

The notional twelve Etruscan cities were believed to each have a *fascēs*, and that these were gathered together and given to the leader of the twelve cities in times of joint

military action, or in one case, to Tarquinius Priscus, as described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but he goes on to say that the practice may have begun with Romulus (3. 61). Romulus is noted elsewhere as taking up the twelve lictors (Livy, 1.8.2; Plutarch, *Rom.* 26.2.3; Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.6.7).

Servius Tullius is also mentioned as not venturing to 'assume even the insignia of royalty without the permission of the people. For, that he might be allowed to be preceded by the twelve lictors carrying the rods' (Cicero *De rep.* 2. 17).

praetor/praetores

Written source, possible inscription

This term is described as the highest military position (*RE praetor*). It relates literally to 'precede in battle'. The title was created originally for two Republican magistrates, who were chosen annually to serve as eponymous heads of state, and act as chief magistrates under the consuls (*OCD* third ed.).

- The *elogia Tarquiniensia*, which are fragments of statue bases inscribed in Latin, dated to the first century AD, which are argued to be a chronological list of members of the college of sixty *haruspices*, related to the Spurinnas family of Tarquinia (Torelli 1975: 30). One particular Spurinna is believed to be the same as that from the Tomb of the Orcus at Tarquinia, where he is described as a *zilath mechl rasnal*. On the *elogia*, however, the Latin description of his title seems to be *praetor* (as reconstructed by Torelli), and so Torelli concludes that *zilath* equals *praetor* (Torelli 1975: 60, 66-69, 70; Cornell 1978: 170-171).

rex/reges

Written source, inscription

The term *rex* is always used by the ancient Latin authors when describing the Roman kings. For instance, Tarquinius Priscus becoming king is described as follows *Haec eum haud falsa memorantem ingenti consensu populus Romanus regnare iussit*, or 'the people with striking unanimity, named him king' (Livy, 1. 35. 6).

The term *rex* is also associated with priestly roles, such as augury. Romulus used a *lituus* to take observations when he founded Rome and became king (Cicero *De div.* 1. 30). In other cases the two roles are mentioned as being separate, with king Numa needing the aid of an *augur*, in order to have the kingly power conferred on him (Livy, 1. 18. 7).

- The foot of a *bucchero* cup, dated to the last quarter of the sixth century BC, inscribed with the word *rex* was found in the Regia of Rome, which has been suggested as further evidence of this being the residence of the *rex* or *rex sacrorum*, king of rites (Figure II.12) (Cornell 1985: 234; Cristofani 1990: 22-23, fig 1.9; *CIL* 1², 4, 2830). This inference is not necessarily so, however, and does not give a clearer idea of the role of the *rex* (Smith 1996: 186).
- The *elogia Tarquiniensia* is interpreted as also describing a *rex* Orgolnius of Caere (fr. 3, ll. 3-4), and has been used to argue for the existence of kings at Caere during the fourth century, according to Torelli (1975: 39-40, 72), or the fifth century BC, according to Cornell (1978: 171).

Sacerdos Etruriae

Written source

The term *sacerdos* refers to a priestly status. *Sacerdos Etruriae* is referred to as the possible priestly role that held power across Etruria. In the description of the individual who became king of Veii, he is mentioned as having ruined a festival of the twelve cities because he was not chosen as priest, or *sacerdos* (Livy, 5.1.5).

Greek Term:

kadmiloi

Inscription

This term has been defined as a group of Etruscan ‘priests’, and an equivalent to the Etruscan term *camilli* (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 187).

- TLE 819a, glosses (Dion. Hal., 2.22.2; Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.8.6; Servius, *ad Aen* 11.543)

The Etruscan terms related to important status are still only understood at a surface level. Many of them have only been found in a small number of instances, the probable magistracies in particular. Despite this, the terms are often given precise definitions (cf. Bonfante and Bonfante 2002). In some cases, these definitions vary between works, for instance *maru* is defined by Scullard as *aedile* (1967: 226), whereas it is defined as *quaestor* by Cristofani (1999: 161); however, these two Latin terms are very different. The differences in opinion display just that; that the terms are still open to debate, and may not ever be solved.

Problems with the sources are largely ignored in many of the related works, by using the terms to discuss social structures, regardless of temporal and regional differences. The most often discussed terms, *zilath* and *rex*, are far from being settled. In the case of looking for equivalents in Latin, the term *rex* is often begun with as a known point; however, because this term held different meanings for the Romans, depending on time period, social class, etc., it cannot present an exact equivalent for the Etruscan term, but at most a possible point of reference. Bilingual texts are seen as the best available sources, but these are not perfect keys to two languages; they need to be used cautiously, particularly in the case of the Pyrgi plaques because of the difficulties in translating Phoenician.

Because of these problems with the sources, as well as a prevalent attitude regarding Etruscan society as a homogenous construction, the Etruscan terms have been forced to fit into a mould of Roman society. All of the potential Etruscan magistracy titles have been given Latin equivalents (*aedile*, *praetor*, *quaestor* and *rex*). These Roman offices, arguably, are particular to Rome. Assuming that the political terms, and therefore political systems of Republican Rome are parallel to those of the Etruscans is inappropriate. As a part of this, the relative importance of terms related to Etruscan titles has been created. Bonfante and Bonfante propose a hierarchy of magistracies, defined by 'conventional equivalents ... for the sake of convenience' in descending order: *purth*, *lauchume*, *zilath*, *camthi* and *maru* (Bonfante and Bonfante 2002: 111). This list is based on a series of suppositions which do not appreciate the problems involved, including basing their definitions on possible Latin equivalents. All five of these terms, however, have never been found together, to allow for such as concrete hierarchy. Interestingly, the Sarcophagus of the Magistrate, from the second half of the third century BC at Tarquinia, contains four terms associated with important statuses: *creal*, *lauchme* (*lucarcie*), *netsvis* and *parnich*. These terms have been defined as two types of magistracies or priesthoods (*creal* and *parnich*), king or consul (*lauchme*) and *haruspex* (*netsvis*). It is argued here that the nature and the duties associated with these titles are not clearly understood. What is noteworthy, however, is that in Tarquinia during the third century BC, at least, it was possible for one individual to hold all of these roles, although probably not all simultaneously, indicating overlapping between the political and religious spheres.

The full meanings of the Etruscan terms are still very unclear, particularly for the period under study. Even the later period, from which the inscriptions date, show a variety of terms used in isolation or in different combinations across the region. This indicates that there was some degree of variability between the settlements. Because of all of the inherent problems in understanding the Etruscan terms, they should be approached sceptically, and not assumed to conform to a picture commonly held (for a discussion of jumping to conclusions, see Wiseman 2001). To discuss the terms more generally, the presence of many terms related to titles (at least in the later period) shows the existence of different types of authority with different

responsibilities and duties. In addition, the classical authors suggest that the Etruscans were seen as creating authoritative statuses related to ritual knowledge and warrior activities, which came to Rome, namely the *haruspices*, *augures* and *lictors*, mentioned by Livy, Cicero, Silus Italicus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (see above).

To investigate the development of authoritative social statuses in the Etruscan culture, the rest of the available archaeological evidence must be considered. Trying to define the terms described above in relation to each other cannot reveal social developments of the Etruscans, particularly of the Orientalising and Archaic periods. The following chapters will deal with the archaeological data by site (IV), with particular attention to iconography from the monumental architecture from these sites (V), which is then viewed in the light of iconography from across contexts, from the same, as well as other sites (VI).

D. CONCLUSIONS

Much of the research concerning the development of the Etruscans deals with the social, political and ritual spheres. Many scholars, however, concentrate on one type of archaeological data, related to ritual or funerary developments, or on the language. Others investigate Etruria from the viewpoint of Rome, by applying ancient literature or historical data concerning the latter to Etruscan contexts, usually depicting Etruscan developments as slower, less effective, or inferior to those of Rome. The development of Rome, it could be argued, is not analogous to any other part of Italy.

Focusing on one form of data, such as temple location, has resulted in attempting to determine the source of control over different types of ritual structures (i.e. urban temples are controlled by the urban centre) (Edlund 1987). In order to understand the development of ritual space and its possibly more complex relations to the political and social spheres, a wider scope must be examined. Similarly, the use of Rome (and sometimes Athens) as a comparative perspective has led to discussions of 'tyrants' ruling in Etruria. While this political development in Rome is a crucial one to

consider, archaeological evidence from specific Etruscan sites must be examined before accepting the assumption that this type of leadership was widespread.

I suggest that to understand better Etruscan society during the Orientalising and Archaic periods the ritual, social and political spheres need to be considered as being intimately connected. My project aims to investigate the development of authoritative roles during this period. The relationships between the three spheres mentioned were directly affected by the development of authority over the related practices and structures. In particular, investigating the first examples of monumental architecture in the region suggests that the architectural forms and the iconographic decorations can be seen to help define the functions of the structures and the roles of the residents. Considering the choices behind the construction, decoration, function and destruction (in many cases) of the structures offers a new perspective to understanding how the authority over these structures and activities transformed over time. Integrating this material into a wider context that considers the development of the settlements and necropoleis at each site in question, avoids the problems associated with too narrow a focus.

Following this, Part Two contains three chapters, which present the material under study. In the next chapter, the data from the chosen sites with ritual architecture will be examined. This has been divided into three main sections (as described in Chapter I.B). Specific salient elements brought into light in Chapter IV will then be discussed in Chapters V and VI, in relation to findings from other sites, many of which do not have evidence of ritual structures from the seventh and sixth centuries.

IV. THE SITES

**A. SITES WHICH DID NOT SURVIVE PAST
THE SIXTH CENTURY BC**

ACQUAROSSA

A. INTRODUCTION

The site of Acquarossa, six kilometres north of modern Viterbo, is one of the most interesting sites because of its domestic and monumental architecture. Zone F is renowned for the monumental complex, although fifteen other sections of the area were also excavated, all by the Swedish School. The settlement was located on a large plateau, measuring approximately thirty-two hectares, in the centre of southern Etruria between Volsinii (Orvieto), Caere, Tarquinia and Vulci (Figure IV.2) (Rystedt 1986: 30). There is early evidence of metalworking in the area (Persson 1994: 301).

B. FUNERARY CONTEXTS

Relatively little funerary evidence has been uncovered so far. What has been published is of such an early date or poorly published that the data are insufficient to discuss any of the particular tombs in detail. Seven necropoleis are known to surround the inhabited area of Acquarossa, and another five are located further afield (Östenberg 1983: 44). Four of the nearby necropoleis have been excavated to some extent and shown to be contemporary with the Archaic phase of the settlement, including Tre Marie, Prato Campo, S. Cataldo and Macchia Grande (see Östenberg 1983 for a summary). I will briefly describe the published tombs that relate to the period under study (despite the settlement being very short-lived, there are later tombs that related to other small, neighbouring settlements of the Roman period).

The five known tombs from the Tre Marie necropolis have been excavated (Vidén 1978: 68). Tombs 1, 3 and 5 were *fossa* burials containing some skeletal material, pottery and fibulae. Tombs 2 and 4 were cremation burials with differing forms; both however, contained vases. Tomb 2 was cut into the rock, while tomb 4 was a small, ovoid niche in the earth. The tombs have been described as dating to the late Iron Age (Viden 1978: 68). It is interesting that out of five burials, three different forms are represented.

Nine chamber tombs from the San Cataldo area, the neighbouring plateau to the east, have been excavated (Roos 1994: 209). Tombs 1 and 2 both date to the middle of the sixth century

BC; Tomb 1 seems to have been re-used in the fourth century AD. The finds included small amounts of pottery, including mostly impasto and *bucchero*. Tombs 3 and 7 are Hellenistic, and were probably in use no earlier than the fourth century BC. Tombs 4, 6, and 8 date to the early sixth century, again containing impasto and *bucchero* pottery. Tomb 5 had few finds and probably dates to the late sixth century BC. Tomb 9 dates to the second half of the seventh or early sixth centuries BC and contained only a small number of finds (Roos 1994: 213-218, 236-244, 254-256).

Three tombs from the Fèrento necropolis were published in 1902; they are, however, poorly understood because of the early date of excavation (Pasqui 1902: 84-94). They were chamber tombs containing multiple inhumations, the first containing three, two male and one female, the second tomb containing five individuals and the third containing two. All contained finds including impasto ware and *bucchero*. One of the males in the first tomb was associated with a sacrificial knife made of iron (Pasqui 1902: 89).

A number of tombs is very briefly discussed in terms of their contents. These include a group of chamber tombs from the Campo dei Pozzi area, some in the 'South' necropolis (Scheffer 1972: 68-69) and others from Fèrento ('Gli Etruschi' 1972: 62-77). This small amount of information is unhelpful, however, for my discussion.

Without further excavation of the necropoleis of Acquarossa, it is impossible to discuss the progression of burial practices and their relationship to the development of the settlement. It is postulated that between 4,000 and 7,000 inhabitants, that is 120-210 people per hectare, lived at the settlement, or conversely that 130 burials per year for Acquarossa's 100 year existence would equate to 13,000 burials potentially (Persson 1986: 43; Persson 1994: 293-294).

C. SETTLEMENT CONTEXTS OF A NON-RITUAL NATURE

The excavation of settlement areas has focused on Zones B, F, C, G, K and L; however, the publications have focused on only a few of these areas (Rystedt 1986: 31). Most of the structures are believed to be domestic houses, with the exception of Zone F, which will be discussed in section D. Approximately seventy houses were excavated, usually consisting of two or three rooms with right angles, but always irregular in shape (Persson 1994: 293). The houses were constructed with tufa block foundations and half timber or clay brick walls. The settlement prospered from the end of the seventh century to its destruction in the second half of the sixth century BC (Rystedt 1986: 32).

Zone B is a complicated mixture of structures (Figure IV.3) (Persson 1986: 41). The curvilinear and rectangular building styles, as well as different building levels, indicate that the area was modified over time. An open area, or “courtyard” was developed in between the structures with wells and storage pits (Persson 1994: 297). Various functions of the structures for different periods have been suggested, such as work places, meeting places, and a street that may have led to Zone F (Persson 1986: 41).

The monumental areas of Zones C and F were excavated together because of their proximity (Figure IV.4) (see the next section for full details of Zone F). This area illustrates the development of what is construed as urbanisation at the site with buildings at right angles to each other and a street running between them (Persson 1986: 41, 42; Strandberg Olofsson 1984: 14). At least three building phases are present in the structures from both zones. Between Zones F and C runs a road (four metres wide at its narrowest point and at least 35 metres long) lined with kerbstones, which marks a break from the rectilinear planning by curving around building ‘F’ of Zone C (not to be confused with Zone F) (Persson 1986: 42; Persson 1994: 299). The road was paved with large tuff blocks and a layer of hard stones, attesting to the amount of labour needed to construct it. It has been suggested that the road predates the rectilinear structures because of its meandering path. A large ditch runs north of Zone F, which may have been used as a stone quarry for the buildings in this area. Remains of retaining walls located to the north and east of Zone F have been suggested as evidence of flooding (Wikander and Wikander 1984: 22; Persson 1994: 297-299).

Iron Age huts have been found in Zone G, measuring 6x12 metres (Östenberg 1975: 27; Torelli 1983: 475). The roofs were covered with terracotta decorations, including frieze plaques made of red impasto, painted with white designs (referred to as the “white on red” style), dating to the mid to late seventh century, which are believed to be inspired by impasto pottery painting. Other similar decorative terracottas were found in Zone A, part of B, numerous in F, G and H, most of which are painted with subgeometric horse motifs and guilloches, or double-braids (Wikander 1988: 126; Wikander 1981).

Zone N, at Pian del Sale, also contains evidence of possible urbanisation (Persson 1986: 42). Despite only being partially excavated, four building foundations were uncovered which demonstrate regular planning of rectilinear domestic houses of a non-monumental nature (Persson 1994: 300).

Neither defensive walls nor gates were found; however, this may be due to some of the structures being located on the edges of the plateau, creating a “wall of defense” (Persson 1986: 42). Water seems to have been an important consideration for the construction of the settlement. A significant number of wells and storage containers has been found associated with every ‘secular’ building at the site, probably due to poor access to fresh or ground water. Drainage channels were also constructed to direct drain rainwater across the site, particularly in Zone F (Persson 1994: 293).

D. RITUAL CONTEXTS

The monumental complex in Zone F suggests a combination of sacred and secular functions (Bergquist 1973: 21) (Figure IV.5). The excavators have identified two building phases and two destruction phases. The first, or lower, level represents the Late Orientalising phase, the earliest parts of which were constructed near 625 BC, and then destroyed during a ‘great conflagration’ in 550 BC. The later Archaic Monumental Complex was probably built immediately after its initial destruction, and then destroyed for the last time circa 525 BC. The second phase was very short-lived; however, it did see a major extension of the area, as well as the introduction of an extensive architectural terracotta reparatory (Wikander and Wikander 1990: 204).

The lower level consisted mostly of building C, which was a twenty-five metre long porticoed structure (Wikander and Wikander 1990: 199; Persson 1994: 299). This was accompanied by buildings D and J to the South-West, which may have formed a unit together, creating a triangular courtyard suggested by a cutting in the bed rock. Building B stood at the north end of building C. In addition, building H stood to the north of building C, but its relationship is not clearly understood. Painted frieze plaques of the “white on red” style are also associated with the structure during this period (Figure IV.6) (Wikander 1981: 47-85). This included one of the most curious fragments of a frieze plaque with the lower part of a man seated in a chair, which is reminiscent of the later low relief frieze plaques showing seated assembly scenes at Murlo, Rome and Velletri (Wikander 1981: 58, fig. 76, fig. 30; Wikander 1988: 92, 93, 125). This style of plaque has also been found in Zones A, B, G, H (Wikander 1988: 126).

The second construction phase involved rebuilding parts of the initial structure, which still remained (which seems to have included slightly realigning building C), as well as adding to the south end to connect or reconnect buildings D and C. Building B seems to show the prior alignment of building C (Persson 1994: 299). Building A, to the West was also constructed during this period. It consisted of a porticoed building, creating a North end of the complex, and transforming the courtyard into one that was more rectangular.

It has been debated whether or not structures existed on the West side of the courtyard (Bergquist 1973: 34; Strandberg Olofsson 1984: 21; Wikander and Wikander 1990: 197; Persson 1994: 299). The western area is at a higher level than the rest of the Zone; however, modern ploughing has all but razed this particular area. That being said, the remains of building J are unclear; there probably would have been a more defined western edge. The entrance is believed to have been in the South-West or western areas (Persson 1994: 300).

The second, or Archaic phase, was probably constructed immediately afterwards (Wikander and Wikander 1990: 189). The two main wings of the structure, buildings A and C, are believed to have possibly had religious functions. The North wing, or building A, has been reconstructed with three *cellae*, a frontal portico and an ‘altar’ in the courtyard in front of it. Room 4 at the south end of building C has been debated as either having dining or ritual

functions. The bench-like stone slabs lining the edges of the room have been identified as supports for dining couches, which, in addition to tables, a paved floor, drainage channels, heating facilities and red-painted wall plaster, make this function likely. A large number of architectural terracottas was found, including antefixes and relief plaques. Area D, in the south, may also have contained an altar (Berquist 1973: 21-23).

The feature in the courtyard area south of building A is interpreted as an altar by Bergquist (1973: 21). A different term, however, might be more appropriate because it is a cut rectangular feature in the soil and rock, rather than a built structure. It is somewhat similar to the cut rectangular feature in front of the proposed ritual area of the Murlo complex (see the Murlo discussion below in Chapter IV.i) (Phillips 1993: 9, fig 7).

Building H lies to the north of the complex consisting of buildings A-D, and is not thought to be intimately connected to the other structures (Persson 1994: 299). Buildings E and G lie to the east of the complex. Building G is believed to be contemporary with the first phase of the complex, while building E is contemporary with the last (Persson 1994: 300).

Torelli suggests that building F in Zone C, described above, should be viewed as contemporary with the final phase of Zone F, and as having a ritual function (Torelli 1983: 475-479). Both the complex and building F share the same alignment. He states that the form with a small ante-room and a large main room makes the ritual nature probable. Many of the domestic houses in Acquarossa share this feature, however. Because of a lack of finds associated with this structure it is difficult to define its function.

Four types of frieze plaques were found within the courtyard of the Zone F structures, all measuring 60x21 cm (Figure IV.7) (see discussion in Chapter V) (Strandberg Olofsson 1984: 22). The transformation from painted to low relief frieze plaques is believed to represent a third phase of architectural decoration at the site (Wikander 1988: 126). Remains of paint indicate that the frieze plaques were painted differently within the same type. Two of the frieze plaques have been interpreted as Heraclean scenes, with Heracles depicted as larger than the other figures. Type A depicts a man at the far right of the scene with a long staff facing a procession proceeding towards the right, including two people in a chariot led by winged horses followed by Heracles and the Cretan Bull, followed, in turn, by two soldiers.

Type B depicts a procession going to the left, with a pair of soldiers on horsebacks followed by a standing soldier who has turned to look at Heracles and the Nemean Lion, followed, in turn, by a chariot led by two horses with a driver and a soldier alighting. Type C is a banqueting scene (which has also been found at Tuscania, and is similar to others found at Tarquinia and Murlo, and to the VRV plaques, which will be discussed in Chapter V). It depicts two *klinai*, or couches, with three people reclining on each, with musicians and servants attending them, and food-laden tables in front of each couch, with dogs lying below. Type D is a dancing scene depicting musicians playing, wine drinking and dancing. The male central figure is nude, larger than the other figures and standing on his head.

Antefixes in the form of human heads, possibly female, adorned the edges of the roof surrounding the inner courtyard (Figure IV.8) (Strandberg Olofsson 1984: 22). They measured 14x14 cm, consisting of a round face with an ‘archaic smile’ and low forehead. A ribbon separated the face from the arrangement of hair streaming backwards as if wavy or braided. Traces of paint were found on the antefixes as well. Both the frieze plaques and antefixes appear to have adorned the inner or front of building A and C due to their distribution patterns (see Strandberg Olofsson 1984: 38-48).

E. CONCLUSIONS

Acquarossa shows a small degree of urban planning, but not in a unified way. It seems to have been more of an organic development ‘from a village of huts to an Etruscan “stone-built town”’ (Persson 1994: 301). The monumental complex in Zone F is the focus of the investigation. Its form and decoration provide some of the information otherwise missing due to its destruction from antiquity up to modern times. Comparing the similarities of this structure with other destroyed ritual structures from this period, as well as investigating the links with other towns which shared the same or similar frieze plaque decorations, will further illuminate the changing functions of the structure and its inhabitants.

CASTELNUOVO BERARDENGA

A. INTRODUCTION

A large structure of ritual nature was located at the site of Castelnuovo Berardenga on Piano Tondo, located between Siena and Arezzo. The site itself had been badly damaged by extensive ploughing during the past century; however, there are clear traces of an enormous structure, possibly measuring fifty square metres in size (Mangani 1985: 155). Unfortunately, the extent of the site has not been determined, so, there are no settlement data, and very little funerary data.

B. FUNERARY CONTEXTS

There are three chamber tombs very near the monumental complex structure, which date from the last quarter of the seventh to the early sixth century respectively (Figure IV.9 shows tombs A and B) (Mangani 1985: 159; Mangani 1990: 1-11). The tombs were lined with thin travertine stones. Tomb A, measuring 2.45x5.4 metres, is considered a 'princely' tomb due to the inclusion of parts of a two-wheeled chariot, two bronze shields, two iron spear points, several iron daggers and an iron short sword. The tomb also contained an ornately decorated comb, an ivory pyxis bowl, bronze vases, *bucchero* vessels, two of which contained inscriptions, as well as a *bucchero* chalice with miniature cariatid supports (Mangani 1985: 160; Bocci Pacini 1973: 124). Tomb B, measuring 3.6x4.5 metres, consisted of a *dromos* leading from the entrance to a rectangular chamber with two central pillars. The tomb contained considerable finds including *impasto rosso* from Chiusi, *bucchero* and a bronze belt. It has been badly damaged by agricultural activity, however (Mangani 1985: 160). Tomb C, unfortunately, was badly damaged and not described as thoroughly as the others, but has been dated to the second half of the sixth century BC (Mangani 1990: 10).

The wealth evident in the tombs, made the excavator, Mangani, surmise that this site was an important 'princely centre' between coastal and northern Etruria, in addition to being placed

within a sphere of settlements in the Ombrone valley, on an important communication route, between centres such as Murlo and Asciano (Mangani 1985: 160; Mangani 1990: 1-10).

C. RITUAL CONTEXTS

The main structure at Castelnuovo Berardenga is poorly understood, partly because the area has been so badly damaged by agricultural activities that little of the structure remains. Two perpendicular rows of postholes have been recovered, suggesting that a structure measuring at least 20x50 metres stood there (Figure IV.10) (Talocchini 1980: 552-553, fig 12; Mangani 1985: 155). The postholes contained fragments of burnt wood, indicating that the structure had a double colonnaded courtyard, which the excavators liken to the complex at Murlo (ibid). Unfortunately, the excavation took place during two separate seasons, and the plans belonging to each have not been properly integrated. Rather than searching for the remains of walls potentially surrounding the postholes, the modern vineyard in the area to the west was excavated (Talocchini 1980: 552-553; Mangani 1985: 155, fig 4.1). The circular markings in the centre of the plan relate to holes from tree roots. In the two longest gullies associated with the vineyard, running roughly north-south, the remains of architectural terracottas were found (Talocchini 1980: 550, fig 12). The terracottas included female head antefixes and roof tiles, along with *bucchero* pottery, impasto kyathoi and spindlewhorls, all of which date the structure from the mid-seventh to early sixth century (Talocchini 1980: 553; Mangani 1985: 156). The destruction of the structure is dated to the early sixth century, after which the area was completely abandoned (Mangani 1985: 156).

D. CONCLUSIONS

Spivey and Stoddart argue that the position of Castelnuovo Berardenga, in a corridor between principal Etruscan cities, caused its destruction, as at Murlo and Acquarossa (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 54). Unfortunately, the full nature of the site is unknown. It is impossible to say if this was a true settlement, complete with other habitation structures, or if this 'monumental complex' was an isolated entity with its associated tombs nearby. Its destruction in the early sixth century BC is, of course, interesting, and should be discussed in relation to the other structures with similar circumstances.

POGGIO CIVITATE, MURLO

A. INTRODUCTION

Murlo was the first ‘monumental complex’ to be excavated, and continues to be the earliest Etruscan site to contain architecture of this nature. Therefore, it has been the centrepiece of discussions related to early architecture and the role of aristocrats for central Italy. The site is located south of Siena, making it the northern-most Etruscan site to contain monumental architecture from this period. Unfortunately, the excavations have focused only on the central Poggio Civitate area where the monumental complex was discovered. Because of this, there are no data concerning settlement or non-ritual architecture. In addition, the main necropolis is believed to be located on the nearby Poggio Aguzzo, where tombs have apparently been located, but have never been excavated (Phillips 1993: 2). While there is not much information concerning the rest of the potential site, Murlo has been included as one of the main sites for discussion, rather than in section IV.iii, because Murlo commands an important place in the investigation into the functions of monumental complexes.

B. RITUAL CONTEXTS

The excavations at Poggio Civitate, Murlo revealed two similar phases of a monumental structure, which were approximately sixty square metres in size. The structure consisted of four wings, three of which were porticoed, all surrounding a courtyard (Figure IV.11) (Phillips 1993:55). The layout of the structure and some of the curious architectural terracottas indicate an overlapping of sacred and secular functions.

Remains of a ‘Lower Building’ from the Orientalising Period constructed in approximately 675-650 BC were found underlying an Archaic layer. Prestige items of stone, ivory, metal including jewellery and bronze statuettes, and pottery, are associated with this structure. These items were found within a burnt layer, indicating that the structure was destroyed by fire (Phillips 1993: 51-54, 74). Architectural decorations were also found from this period, including a ridgepole tile, an akroterion with a horse and rider design, a sima shaped like a

feline head, an antefix in the form of a human face (Figure IV.12) and a smoke vent in the shape of a griffin head (Phillips 1993: 57-59). A substantial amount of local pottery, including *bucchero*, and Greek pottery suggests the importance of banqueting at the structure (Phillips 1993: 61, 68). The remains of the building material and precious objects were scattered across the area to make new foundation areas for the succeeding construction phase. The remains of the Orientalising structure were excavated below the western flank of the later structure; however, it is believed that the Orientalising structure had the same general plan as the Archaic level (Phillips 1993: 51-54). The Lower Building appears to have burned down in the last quarter of the seventh century BC, followed shortly thereafter by the construction of the Archaic level in about 610 BC (Phillips 1972: 252).

The Archaic structure consisted of stone foundations with mudbriek or pisé walls (Phillips 1993: 13). The South wing of the structure is believed by the excavator to have contained 'shops', the North wing to have had political and dining functions, and the West wing to have had religious functions (Phillips 1993: 10). This West wing appears to have had three *cellae* with a rectangular feature in front, which is believed to have been an open-air structure with a ritual function, such as temporarily housing animals for sacrifice (Phillips 1993:9). Three entrances have been found, one on the North wing in room 6, another in the West wing through room 11, and the main entrance probably being situated in the East wing through room 20 (Phillips 1993:9, fig 7). The functions of the rooms attached to the North end of the East wing, off the main complex structure, are not understood. A building parallel to the North wing was discovered, as well as another smaller court located south of the South wing, while another part was a tile factory that burned down (Phillips 1993: 12; Nielsen 1987). A large defensive *fossa* runs along the outside of the North and West wings (Phillips 1993: 12).

The Archaic monumental complex was highly decorated with architectural terracottas (see also the discussion in Chapter V). The ridgepole of the roof of the North wing held several life-size statues of human and mythological figures, including the 'Murlo Cowboy' statue of a male figure seated on a four-legged stool and wearing a large hat, his hands showing tubular spaces where an item, such as a staff, was held (Figure IV.14). Other statues, although badly fragmented, including a male figure, possibly seated, and wearing a close-fitting cap, as well as a bust indicating a female statue, possibly seated or standing, and a pair of feet resting on a low footstool were found. One whole sphinx ridgepole statue, as well as fragments of others

were also present (Figure IV.13). Akroteria included statues of a ram, a wild boar, two horses and a feline (Phillips 1993: 19-27). A series of mould-made architectural terracottas also existed. These included gorgon head antefixes, raking simas with scenes of hounds chasing hares, lateral simas with female Dadedalic heads and feline head spouts (Phillips 1993: 27-38).

The figure frieze plaques from the Archaic monumental complex link this structure with many of the other sites from South Etruria, particularly Veii, as well as with Velletri (in Latium). Four scenes were present on the structure (Figure IV.15). First is the banquet scene depicting two couches with two individuals reclining on each (one of which holds a flower and another plays a lyre), with food-covered tables and dogs lying in front of each couch and servants at each end (Phillips 1993: 40). Second is the horserace scene with three riders with pointed caps and short staffs riding to the right, with a *lebes* or cauldron on the far left, which may represent a trophy. Both of these scenes were found together in an undisturbed destruction layer (Phillips 1993: 42). Third is the procession scene, with two male attendants, one of which holds a knife, leading a pair of horses pulling a two-wheeled cart bearing two figures followed by two female attendants. The figures in the cart, under a parasol, have been suggested to represent a male and a female. The following attendants carry fans, a situla, a pot and a stool. This scene has been interpreted in a number of ways, including a procession to the gods (Gantz 1974: 11-14), to a wedding or to a sacrifice (Fabricotti 1980: 165, see also for a comparison with a frieze plaque from Metaponto). Fourth is the seated figure scene, which depicts five seated and three standing male and female figures. Each of the seated figures holds an attribute and is seated on a stool, except for the second seated figure, who sits on a rounded *trono*, or throne. The full description of this, as well as its numerous interpretations are discussed in Chapters II and V (see also Poggio Civitate 1970: 50-61; Rathje 1993). These two scenes were found scattered across the entire site. (Phillips 1993: 38-45).

The excavators concluded that the complex was a forum or meeting hall because of the combination of functions and activities tied together architecturally (Phillips 1993: 10). The building parallel to the North wing has been interpreted as a priest's house, and the small court located south of the South wing has been interpreted as a defensive tower (Phillips 1993: 12). The human statuary figures are interpreted by Phillips as divine beings (Phillips

1993: 47). It is unclear, however, what the interpretation of the priest's house is based on. Likewise, the statuary needs to be further examined in light of the rest of the site and statuary from other sites.

One of the most interesting features of the Archaic layer of Poggio Civitate is, however, its perceived 'ritual destruction'. Between 550-530 BC, the buildings were torn down, the architectural details were broken and buried separately all over the site. The architectural material was buried in a dump to the west, in the fossae surrounding the structure, or scattered on the bedrock then covered with two metres of rubble and soil. The structure itself was then covered with an earthen mound, or *agger*, preserved in parts to a height of four metres. The site was then abandoned until the Middle Ages. (Phillips 1972: 251; 1993: 48-49; Edlund 1994: 17). Phillips argues that the Archaic 'Meeting Hall' was destroyed by the rulers of Chiusi during the height of their expansion (Phillips 1993: 49). In addition, he stated that Murlo represented the seat of a possible 'Northern Etruscan League', and served as a regional centre and meeting place (Phillips 1993: 80). This is purely speculation, however, and does not seem to be the most reasonable interpretation.

C. CONCLUSIONS

I disagree with the idea of the Northern League. In light of the discoveries of many other monumental structures from this period, this idea is not viable. It still remains, however, that this site demonstrates an overlapping of political and ritual activities. Unfortunately, the lack of settlement and funerary evidence makes it difficult to examine Murlo as a whole. Its development and destruction must be examined within the context of the region as a whole. Pinpointing potential rivals with motives for tearing down the monumental complex actually does little for interpreting the function of the site. The ritual destruction with deliberate breaking and burying of the architectural details indicates that the structure and its decorations communicated powerful (and controversial messages). The particular breaking and scattering of the procession and seated assembly scenes, with images of elites carrying out their duties, suggests that those scenes were especially evocative and caused strong responses.

**B. SITES WHICH SURVIVED PAST
THE SIXTH CENTURY BC**

CAERE

A. INTRODUCTION

Caere, or modern Cerveteri, is one of the most famous Etruscan towns. It existed from the ninth century to the late Hellenistic period. Most of what is known, however, comes from its necropoleis and temples, rather than the actual settlement, which is largely unexcavated (Figure IV.16). It was one of the main production sites of *bucchero* pottery for several centuries. The associated port site of Pyrgi was a key location for trade and contact with the rest of the Mediterranean, as well as being a ritual area with two temples.

Classical literature and inscriptions concerning Caere have led to a number of assumptions related to its political institutions (see Chapter II.C for a discussion of the terms). The famous Pyrgi Plaques have been used to suggest the existence of a king at Caere in the early fifth century BC. A later inscription related to a Republican magistrate at Tarquinia refers to a king of Caere named Orgolnius, possibly during the fifth century BC, although the dating has been problematic (Torelli 1975: 45 suggests that it might be as late as the 350's BC; cf. Cornell 1978: 171; Cornell 1995: 229-230). The meanings behind these terms are unclear, and cannot be assumed to match specific expectations associated with 'kings' of other contexts. Caere's close relationship with Rome is attested by Plutarch's account of the Vestal Virgins obtaining refuge in Caere during the sacking of Rome in 390 BC (Livy *Ad urbe condita* 5.40; Plutarch, *Camill* 22.3). It is also believed that Pyrgi was sacked by Dionysius of Syracuse in 384 BC largely because of its alliance with Rome (Sordi 1960: 62-72; Cornell 1995: 316). All of these assumptions related to literature and epigraphy have neglected to consider the archaeological data from the site.

B. FUNERARY CONTEXTS

1. NECROPOLEIS

There is an enormous amount of funerary data from Caere; much of it, however, was gathered in the early twentieth century and is unsystematic. The forms of the burials themselves have been, for the most part, well-documented. The grave goods, however, are usually without contextual information now. The two main necropoleis are Il Sorbo and Banditaccia, while those of San Paolo and Monte Abatone are not well published.

a) SORBO

This necropolis lies to the South-West of the plateau on which Caere is situated. The burials were excavated by Raniero Mengarelli in 1911 and 1916, and published later in 1955 (Ricci 1955: 201-1035). There are over 450 burials, half of which were *pozzi* with cremations, while the other half were *fossa* graves with inhumations, dating from the late ninth to the early seventh century. There were also a few Orientalising tombs, such as the famous Regolini-Galassi Tomb. The burials were distributed across the plateau without strict orientation rules. The pre-Orientalising tombs contained material of a homogenous nature with locally made pottery and a small number of bronze objects, such as fibulae. The few Orientalising tombs were dramatically different in form and character, with large tumuli and exotic grave goods. Interestingly, there is almost a complete lack of weaponry found in the Sorbo burials. (Pohl 1972: 1-2, 293-294; Ricci 1955).

b) BANDITACCIA

The majority of burials from the following periods was located in the Banditaccia necropolis, roughly from the early seventh to the second century BC (Figure IV.17). The plateau lies to the north and parallel with the ancient city. The grand, Orientalising tumuli from the seventh and early sixth centuries BC demonstrate the economic peak and influx of foreign goods at Caere. The tumuli were constructed with earthen mounds heaped onto a circular tufa foundation, either cut directly into the bedrock or built of cut tuff blocks. Many of the tumuli contain multiple chamber

tombs, each containing multiple chambers and burials. In contrast, cube-tombs began to appear in the middle of the sixth century, restricted in size, and laid out in rows, sometimes opening onto open square spaces cut into the tufa. A main road, 'Via degli Inferi', ran through the necropolis and up onto the plateau of Caere, allowing the display of tombs to greet visitors and for funerary procession (Boitani, Cataldi and Pasquinucci 1975: 160-163; Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 232).

2. PARTICULAR TOMBS

There is a vast number of tombs at Cerveteri. The unique style of Cerveteri's tumuli makes them special: rather than having paintings within, for the most part, the majority of the tumuli were adorned with sculpted features on the walls and ceilings. Because so many of the tombs were dug unsystematically, many of the grave goods are without context. A bronze *lituus*, believed to date to the seventh century, is known to come from the Banditaccia necropolis, but it is not known from which tomb (Colonna 1985a: 251; *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 241).

There are, however, three clear instances of tombs with chariots or chariot parts from Caere. Two of them were found in the Regolini-Galassi Tomb in the Sorbo necropolis; one is a two-wheeled chariot and the other is a four-wheeled cart. The Regolini-Galassi Tomb is one of the most famous Etruscan chamber tombs. It dates to the mid-seventh century, and consists of two narrow, rectangular rooms positioned along the same axis, like a long corridor, with two circular rooms, one on either side of the central area. The tomb contained three burials, which have been postulated as belonging to one family (Figure IV.18) (Pareti 1955: 100). The inhumation burial of an adult woman, dated to the mid-seventh century BC, was in the cella, or rear room, surrounded by silver objects inscribed with what is believed to be her name, "Larthia", gold jewellery, and seventeen fibulae. The cremation burial of a young boy, dated to the third quarter of the seventh century BC, was found in the right-hand circular room, also containing several Greek vases. The inhumation burial of an adult male was found in the antechamber, along with many bronze objects and shields lining one wall. The adult male is described as having a 'warrior rank' and the female a 'princess rank' (Pareti 1955: 124). The exact placement of the other grave goods is subject to debate (Strøm 1971: 161). The four-wheeled cart remains consist of wheel

rims, two iron axle rods and a laminated basket. The two-wheeled *currus* remains consist of wheel rims, handles, hook ends and lioness protomes (Emiliozzi 1999: 320, citing Canina 1838: 73; Pace, et. al. 1955; Pinza 1907: 35-166; Strøm 1971: 160-68).

C. SETTLEMENT CONTEXTS

The first traces of settlement in the Caere area date to the Middle Bronze Age (1400-1150 BC). During the tenth century BC, or 'Pre-Villanovan' period, settlement structures became more organised throughout the Caeritan territory, with small but visible settlements now being positioned on naturally and easily defensible sites at short distances from each other. Merlino and Mirenta suggest that the territory and society were organised along tribal and familial affinities at this time. During the ninth and eighth centuries BC, or 'Villanovan' period, gradual changes were seen across the landscape (Figure IV.19a). The territory became re-organised due to the development of socio-economic factors, including an intensification of agriculture and growth in population size. The settlement then became focused on the plateau itself. Merlino and Mirenta state that a sense of community existed by this point, possibly including intermarriage between clans for political reasons. Necropoleis were founded at Sorbo to the south-west and Cava della Pozzolana and Laghetto to the north, as well as a small necropolis at Vigna Parrocchiale, actually on the plateau. (Merlino and Mirenta 1990: 4-7).

The settlement of Caere becomes increasingly visible during the Orientalising period, or seventh century BC. Large distributions of ceramic and architectural material, including tufa blocks and tiles, have been found across much of the plateau, although in distinct and separate areas. Architectural developments in the habitation areas are believed to be reflected in the funerary architecture, particularly the large tumuli of Tomba Capanna and Tomba Colonnello, with mock architectural features like roof beams carved into the tufa (Merlino and Mirenta 1990: 20). During the Archaic Period, or sixth century BC, Caere became a 'major metropolis' of southern Etruria, and an important link in Mediterranean trade (Figure IV.19b). Cube tombs, and a new desire to order the space within the funerary sphere, began during this period (Merlino and Mirenta 1990: 12-20, 26-34).

Sacred areas are believed to have been identified on the basis of survey material including architectural terracotta fragments. The material, however, is not described, and I would argue that it is difficult to identify with any certainty that these areas had sacred functions. Remains of structures dating to the second half of the sixth and to early fifth century BC have been found at Sant' Antonio, Vigna Grande, Vignali, the Temple of Manganello and the Temple of Hera. The last two contain remains of tufa blocks; in the case of the last, it is known to have been a temple during the Hellenistic period, but may date even earlier. All of them, with the exception of Vigna Grande, seem to have votive material associated with them (although it is not described in detail, except in the case of Sant' Antonio) (Merlino, Mirenta 1990: 35-38).

Commercial activities increased during this period, with an intensification in agriculture, as well as trade through the port of Pyrgi. This intense building phase during the sixth and fifth centuries BC at Caere has been likened to the Greek world, with tyrants monumentalising towns to develop a broad power base, enabling them to tie social groups to the structures under a unified leadership (Merlino and Mirenta 1990: 31). Making the comparison with Greek tyrants; however, creates inappropriate assumptions of the political contexts at Caere.

D. RITUAL CONTEXTS

There are three main ritual areas on the plateau of Caere with well excavated material for the Orientalising and Archaic periods, which are described below. There is also a number of rural sanctuaries in the territory of Caere, including Sasso di Furbara, Procoio di Ceri and Castellina in inland, hilly areas, and Punta della Vipera in the coastal region (Castellina and Punta della Vipera are described in Section IV.iv) (Colonna 1985a: 149, fig. 18; Merlino, Mirenta 1990: 37). The port site of Pyrgi will also be briefly described here.

1. VIGNA PARROCCHIALE

The site of Caere and its surroundings show a unique set of circumstances. Excavations of the Vigna Parrocchiale, in the centre of the plateau, suggests that the

area had been utilised since the late Villanovan period, as is indicated by fragments of impasto and other types of ceramics. The earliest remains of a structure are believed to date to the Orientalising Period (Maggiani 2001: 121). This was followed by an Archaic structure believed to be a monumental complex, dating to the sixth century, which was discovered within the central area of the settlement plateau of Caere (Figure IV.20). Cristofani, the excavator, described it as a “regal residence” (Cristofani 1997: 51). A sherd of *bucchero* with the word ‘*calatur*’ is claimed to substantiate the regal status of the structure, that is, if this word is akin to ‘*rex*’ (see Chapter II.C) (Maggiani 2001: 121, fig. II.A.2.15). It was a large rectangular structure with a central courtyard. Architectural terracotta decorations from the structure included vividly painted scenes of hunting. Fine pottery for banqueting and cooking, Greek wine amphorae, and a large amount of domestic animal bones, mostly bovine, were found. The monumental complex was destroyed c. 500-490 BC (Cristofani 1997: 51).

The decorative terracottas have been divided into two main groups: Archaic and late Archaic (540-500 BC). The Archaic decorative coverings, or ‘*rivestimenti decorativi*’, include painted plaques of the “white on red” style with a guilloche design, and probably date to the first quarter of the sixth century BC (Cristofani 1992: 29, 30).

A huge amount of terracotta decorations come from the late Archaic phase, including: akroteria, high relief statues, terminal tiles, eave tiles, female head antefixes and frieze plaques. The high relief work includes a head of a bearded man, similar to the warrior statue from the Portonaccio temple at Veii (Figure IV.21) (Cristofani 1992: 34, fig. B.13.1, plate II). Several styles of painted terminal tiles were also present. Type III, in particular, with its quadratic meander pattern, is similar to those found at Punta della Vipera, Satricum, and the VRV plaques (Cristofani 1992: 36, fig. B.17.1, tav II; Cristofani 1989-90: 81). Type I of the eaves tiles, which contains a painted palmette design, is also like those found at Punta della Vipera and Satricum (Cristofani 1992: 41, fig. B.26). Another type of eave tile, called the *cortina pendula*, consists of a low relief of pendants similar to those found at Pyrgi Temple B (Cristofani 1992: 42, fig. B.29). There were also five types of female head antefixes,

of which type I is similar to those found at Punta della Vipera and Rome (Regia, Sant' Omobono and the Forum), and type V is like those found at Pyrgi Temple B and Montetosto (Figure IV.22) (Cristofani 1992: 43-46, fig. B30, B34). Several types of painted frieze plaques were discovered. Type I, or A, includes soldiers on horseback riding to the left (Cristofani 1992: 47, fig. B.36, pl. IV), type II, or B, includes centaurs (Figure IV. 23) (Cristofani 1992: 47, fig. B.37, pl. IV), type III, or C, includes a hunting scene (Cristofani 1992: 47, fig. B.38, pl. IV), type D includes dogs walking to the right (Figure IV.24) (Cristofani 1992: 48, pl. IV), and type E includes bulls walking to the right (Cristofani 1992: 47, pl. IV). Also found were a fragment of a painted relief plaque of a helmeted warrior (Cristofani 1992: 50, fig. B.42, pl. V), and a possible procession scene, with a charioteers and a *biga* (Rizzo 1994: 55, fig. 15, 16). Three fragments of a low relief frieze plaque show horses walking to the right (Figure IV.25) (Cristofani 1992: 50, fig. 42, pl. V).

A large subterranean feature was found just to the east of the complex and is believed to be contemporary with the monumental complex (Figure IV.26) (Cristofani 1992: 5-7). It measures approximately 12x5x11 metres, and its original use was probably as a stone quarry for the surrounding building projects. Its function was then converted to that of a water drainage area, indicated by the channels dug into the bedrock connecting the complex with the feature. After the destruction of the monumental complex, circa the early fifth century BC, the feature seems to have been filled in, indicated by slight overlapping of the fifth century structure with the area of the feature (Cristofani 1992: 5-8). It should be noted, however, that this area is not fully understood as yet.

In the first half of the fifth century, a temple was built on the same site, above the destroyed monumental complex (Cristofani 1997: 51). It consisted of a frontal portico and three *cellae* in the rear, and measured twenty-four metres long. Next to it, a large oval building of comparable age was constructed, measuring approximately fifteen metres long, enclosing an open space of 325 square metres (Cristofani 1988: 88). Cristofani believed this circular structure was related to the temple, and possibly used for ceremonial displays and meetings related to the public life of the community. The two structures were positioned around an open space, similar to a '*piazza*' or

agora, to form part of a larger complex. In regard to the rebuilding of this area, Cristofani stated that the new layout was designed “non solo come modello di monumentalizzazione di uno spazio fisico, ma anche come esempio di spazio politicamente simbolico, non a caso sovrapposto a un luogo che era stato in precedenza espressione di un vecchio potere ormai tramontato” (not only the physical monumentalisation of a space, but also as an example of symbolic, political space deliberately superimposed onto what had been the previous expression of an old, by now vanquished power) (Cristofani 1997: 53).

2. SANT' ANTONIO

Two temples near the city gate of Caere are also worth noting. They are dated slightly earlier than the temple and circular structure, one of which is believed to be the sanctuary of *Hercle* (Etruscan Heracles), and the other is connected to *Turms* (Etruscan Mercury). Together with the structures discussed in the preceding paragraph, these two temples may represent a second architectural phase, which appears to reflect the changes in the political and ritual power structures at Caere. This second phase is characterised by a physical, architectural separation between structures that represent the strictly political and the ritual spheres respectively (Cristofani 1997: 51-53). The long-term development of the Sant' Antonio area illustrates the transformations of functions of the area from funerary, habitation and ritual to one of largely ritual. This area is located along the south-west edge of the main plateau for the settlement of Caere (Nardi 1989: 53).

The Iron Age phase of this area is marked by the findings of three adult burials, all inhumations, at least one female (Figure IV.27) (Izzet 1999-2000: 134). Tarquinia is the only other known example of an Etruscan settlement area containing a human burial; in this case, a young male inhumation under the later ritual monumental complex (see the next section of this chapter). Just north of the burials lies a curvilinear hut. Izzet, the excavator, notes that its orientation and entrance placement are the same as the later Archaic temple built on the same site, suggesting a long-term ritual use of this area of Sant' Antonio (Izzet 1999-2000: 134, 136). The hut and surrounding area have been interpreted as having both domestic habitation and cult practice functions, partly because of a small cache of bronze ingots found in pit 1043:

findings of *aes rude* are known almost exclusively from ritual contexts (see Edlund 1987: 56, 63, 136). It has been suggested that this structure marks a period when both types of activities overlapped conceptually and spatially at Caere (Izzet 1999-2000: 137-138). This structure seems to have been deliberately dismantled, indicated by wattle and daub fragments deposited with nearly whole vessels in nearby pits during the late ninth or early eighth centuries. A lack of long-term decay indicates that this was a quick process, and a lack of fire indicates that it was deliberate.

This structure was succeeded by new phases of construction during the Orientalising period. A wooden post building was initially constructed and then replaced by a stone foundation building directly where the hut was located, the remains of which are not fully clear. Banqueting equipment was also found associated with the structure. In addition, the remains of two walls of another rectangular building were found to be parallel with the wall of the later temple. The function of the main structure is uncertain; again the lack of fire or decay suggests that deliberate dismantling occurred (Izzet 1999-2000: 138-141).

In the Archaic Period, at the end of the sixth century or in the early fifth century, two stone temples were erected (Figure IV.28) (Izzet 1999-2000: 141-142). The two are parallel with each other, and face south-west, Temple A measuring 18x24 and Temple B measuring 20x25 metres. The ground area in front of the temples was levelled and pavement laid. Votive objects found nearby suggest the divinities who were worshipped. A bronze club found in the area, and another found later, believed to be associated with temple B, the exact locations of which are unclear, suggest that it was associated with the worship of *Herkle* (Figure IV.30) (Izzet 1999-2000: 144; Cristofani 1997: 52, 54; Rizzo 2001: 153, fig. II.B.5.3). A bronze weight inscribed to *Turms* likewise indicates the worship of this divinity (Figure IV.29) (ibid, Cristofani 1997; Rizzo 2001: 153, fig. II.B.5.2). Small antefixes in the form of female heads were also found (Izzet 1999-2000: 142). Also associated with this construction period is a rectangular pit located south of the temple. It held pottery and animal bones dating to the previous period; the pottery was mostly fineware related to banqueting, such as *bucchero* sottile, red impasto and Etrusco-Corinthian ware (Izzet 1999-2000: 144). It was probably created as a deposit to hold the material from the preceding

building when the temples were constructed, and was actually cut into an older, underlying pit. The temples continued to be used for at least the next two centuries (Izzet 1999-2000: 144).

3. VALLE DELLA MOLA

Also worth briefly noting is a sanctuary located on the south-east end of the plateau of Caere, near Porta di S. Antonio, one of the main entrances to the site (Nardi 2001: 157). It faces tombs dating from the seventh to third centuries BC. The area is badly damaged due to tomb robbing and modern agricultural practices. Despite this, a temple of Greek form (*peripteros sine postico*, or a peripteral temple) was discovered, measuring approximately 9.5x7.5 metres (no published plan exists yet; Figure IV.31 shows a photograph of the area). It is believed to have been an important cult centre until the fifth century BC. An earlier phase, dating probably to the sixth century BC, is evident from findings of an earlier, late Archaic edifice with architectural decorations including frieze plaques and antefixes (Nardi 2001: 157). The frieze plaques included fragments painted with a geometric design in red, black and white, dating to the mid sixth century (Nardi 2001: 158, fig. II.C.1). Other fragments of painted plaques have been found, which depict a male figure holding a lance (Rizzo 1994: 53-54, fig 4-12). Water cults are believed to have been present at all periods of the area, due to findings of canals and cisterns, with the later addition of cuniculi (Nardi 2001: 158). Unfortunately, these findings are not yet fully published, and so the Archaic structure, in particular, is poorly understood.

4. MONTETOSTO

An added twist to the development of Caere comes from the site of Montetosto, between Caere and Pyrgi, the fifth century trading port and temple area (Figure IV.32). It is considered an 'extra-urban' sanctuary by Edlund (1987: 70). The site consists of the foundations of a monumental structure of tuff blocks, measuring roughly 56x64 metres, with four wings surrounding an open courtyard (Figure IV.33). Two separate building phases were distinguished. The first phase, dating to 530-520 BC, included numerous architectural terracotta decorations, including a female head antefix and a full-relief head of a bearded man described as an Egyptian style Heracles, all of which are similar to items found at Pyrgi, as well as a relief plaque

with a horse-riding scene, similar in character to those found at Murlo and Acquarossa (Colonna 1970: 47-48, pl. XIV; Colonna 1985b: 194). The second phase, in the early fifth century, included a maenad head antefix and painted rooftiles; and by the mid-fifth century, antefixes with floral crowns and rooftiles like those found at Pyrgi were introduced. In the early third century, the terracotta decorations remained unaltered, which is also the case with the nearby temple of Pyrgi (see below). The structure seems to have been used until the second or first century, as indicated by the presence of diagnostic pottery (Edlund 1987: 71).

The Montetosto structure is positioned between a large seventh century tumulus to the north, and a spring, 'Fontanile della Tomba', to the south (Colonna 1963: 138; Rizzo 1989: 152-161). The nearby tumulus is one of the biggest in Etruria, with three groups of rooms and a corridor containing extremely rich grave goods, the entrance to which was symbolically guarded by a tuff sphinx (Colonna 1985b: 192; Mengarelli 1927: 170-171, pl. LIIIc). A road separated the structure from the tomb, which is believed to date to the first half of the sixth century (Torelli 1981: 3). Colonna has suggested that the structure was built to appease the gods after the Caeritans slaughtered Phocaeen prisoners of war, according to Herodotus (Colonna 1985b: 195; Colonna 1963: 146). This is a characteristic, historically specific explanation, which has little supporting evidence. The functions of the structure should rather be determined by considering it within the context of its location, outside the site of Caere, and its context as a monumental building of the sixth century in Etruria.

It is difficult at this point to define the exact relationship between the sites of Caere and Montetosto. It is unclear if Montetosto, lying four kilometres outside the urbanised area, was originally considered a true part of the same settlement. The possible twenty to forty year overlap in the existence of the two monumental structures (Montetosto and Vigna Parrocchiale), however, poses some interesting questions. The younger Montetosto structure could represent the rise of a rival power, possibly due to its symbolic connections with the tumulus. Its duration indicates that it was indeed more successful than the Vigna Parrocchiale complex. The redecoration of the Montetosto structure in the early fifth century, which likened it to other newly constructed temples from this period, could represent the redefinition of the character

or function of its residents, and the portrayal of what types of power laid behind the façade of the structure. Interestingly, the Montetosto structure was built much later than the other monumental complex structures in the region. Its success could be due to a number of factors, including: its position outside the settlement area, possibly in an area somewhat independent of Caere, the similarities in its decorative motifs with other 'new' temples of this period, or possibly different functions and activities occurring within.

5. PYRGI

Pyrgi was the primary port of Caere, the two of which were connected by a road 13 kilometres long, lined with tumuli (Figure IV.34). The port area was surrounded by defensive walls, and contained two temples and a long structure with twenty chambers, interpreted as a brothel (Figure IV.35) (Coarelli 1988: 331-340). It was between the two temples that the Pyrgi tablets were found (Pallattino 1964: 58, 59, tav. 28, 29) (see Chapter II.C). The port area is described as an emporion where trade, ritual practices, and possibly prostitution associated with the ritual sphere occurred. Adjacent to the port was a planned settlement area, which dates to the seventh century BC (Spivey and Stoddart 1990: 123-125; Barker and Rasmussen 1989: 167).

The earlier temple, Temple B, was a peripteral Greek style temple, measuring approximately 20x30 metres, and dates to approximately 500 BC, but may have existed in the late sixth century BC. Temple A, dates to 460 BC, and is constructed in a Vitruvian Tuscan style with three cellae, and is slightly larger in size. The rear pediment is a depiction of the Greek myth of the Seven against Thebes (Colonna 1959: 154-170; Pallottino 1964: 53; Cornell 1995: 121). The temples at Pyrgi were finally destroyed in the early third century by Greeks from Syracuse (Colonna 1985a: 130; Prayon 1981: 46; Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 318; but cf. Crawford 1998: 122ff. for a slightly later date).

E. CONCLUSIONS

The existence of only one main necropolis for any one period suggests that there

might have been a large degree of integration between the elite families, clans or groups. The increasing expenditure on the tumuli, particularly during the height of the Orientalising Period, however, suggests that there was also a strong element of competition. This seems to have been restricted, at least in the funerary sphere, by the development of the small cube-tombs. The sixth century also sees massive changes in the ritual sphere for Caere. The monumental complex of Vigna Parrocchiale is constructed, and then destroyed in the early fifth century. Subsequently, two stone temples were constructed in the ritual spaces of the Sant' Antonio area across the plateau; in addition the Valle della Mola area on the edge of the plateau also seems to have had an Archaic phase which was later dramatically altered, and Montetosto, four kilometres outside of Caere, was constructed during the third quarter of the sixth century BC, to last for several centuries. In addition, the port of Pyrgi also developed ritual structures beginning with Temple B in 500 BC. Of the four ritual areas, only Sant' Antonio had votive deposits; Pyrgi developed votive deposits following this period. It is an interesting progression at Sant' Antonio, beginning with three burials and an early foundation deposit including objects like *aes rude*. Then terminal votive deposits were created with each reconstruction phase, particularly between the Orientalising and Archaic phases, by depositing architectural terracottas and other goods. Finally, an active deposit was created during the Archaic period for the deposition of specific votive objects, such as bronze statuettes. The reasons behind this sudden monumentalisation of ritual space at several areas related to Caere need to be examined. Unfortunately, there is a lack of non-ritual settlement data to help us illuminate this. The developments at Caere, however, may reflect changes that can be seen at other Etruscan sites during this period.

Cristofani draws an interesting parallel with contemporary events in Rome. He states that at this time in Rome and other Tyrrhenian cities, dramatic changes occurred in the forms of ritual structures, manifesting the end of monarchies and the development of the Roman Republic. Cristofani believes that the monumental complexes in Etruria, and at Caere in particular, developed as a result of agrarian aristocrats wielding both sacred and secular power, which were later destroyed by tyrants who exerted secular power through mercantile means. As a result, the destruction of the structures symbolically marked the end of an older type of power (Cristofani 1997:

51) (see Chapter V for a discussion of the destruction of ritual structures). It remains to be seen, however, which types of power and authority were wielded during this period, and that it is not likely to have been uniform across the region.

TARQUINIA

A. INTRODUCTION

Tarquinia was one of the most important Etruscan centres, occupied from the ninth century to the early Imperial period, reaching its height during the sixth to fourth centuries BC. It is renowned for its painted tombs. The circumstances behind its importance are similar to those of Caere. Tarquinia is located on the coast, and its port site, Gravisca, created contacts with various parts of the Mediterranean for trade purposes, in addition to being important as a ritual site (Figure IV.36) (Boitani, Cataldi, Pasquiniucci 1975: 181).

Tarquinia featured in a famous piece of classical literature, the result of which explained for many in modern, and possibly ancient times as well, the connection between the Greek and Etruscan cultures. The account that Tarquinius Priscus of the Etruscan dynasty of the Tarquins and the fifth king of Rome (traditionally 616-578 BC), was the son of Demaratus of Corinth (Polybius 6.11a.7), is a convenient means of legitimising how 'Greek' skills developed in central Italy (Ridgway 1992: 119). It has also been seen as an insight into issues of social integration and social mobility between elites of other cultures during the Archaic period (Ampolo 1976-1977: 334-337). Demaratus is credited with bringing Corinthian art to Etruria through his artisan dependants Eucheir, Eugrammos and Diopas, who are associated with the skills of ceramic sculpture, painting and optical measurement, respectively. Tacitus states that Demaratus was responsible for the beginning of Etruscan writing (*Annals* 11.14). Corinthian crafts played an important role in South Etruria during the second half of the seventh century, and Corinthian craftsmen are believed to have settled in Etruria during this time; the specific individuals and their links to elite power, however, are related more to myth than reality (discussed by Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 86,87; Cornell 1995: 124-125; Torelli 1983: 472-477).

B. FUNERARY CONTEXTS

1. NECROPOLEIS

A huge number of burials survives at Tarquinia. It is renowned for its painted tombs, which make up only two percent of the total burials from the site. Some of the oldest burials from the early Iron Age have been discovered on the hills to the east of the settlement area, Pian di Civita, at Selciatello, Sopra Selciatello and Impiccato. These ninth century BC *pozzi* burials consist of biconical impasto urns covered with a bowl or helmet; hut-shaped urns are also characteristic of this period. (Boitani, Cataldi and Pasquiniucci 1975: 181-183; Romanelli 1948: 195).

a) MONTEROZZI

By the middle of the eighth century, the main place of burial became the nearby plateau of Monterozzi. It contains thousands of tombs over a very wide area. Initially, these consisted of *pozzo* tombs with cremations and *fossa* tombs with inhumations. The grand tumuli, consisting of earthen mounds, but not fortified with tufa bases as in Caere, began to be constructed during the late seventh to early sixth century BC. The subterranean burial chambers were usually rectangular rooms cut into the bedrock, reached by steep *dromoi*. Tomb painting began in the seventh century and lasted until the second century BC (the majority of painted tombs is from the fifth century), with approximately 150 surviving examples (Boitani, Cataldi and Pasquiniucci 1975: 184-196; Steingraber 1985: 388).

2. PARTICULAR TOMBS

Of the thousands of burials at Tarquinia, a small percentage of them stand out as being exceptional. As mentioned above, only about 150 of the tombs contained tomb paintings, approximately four of which date to the Orientalising period (700-600 BC) and twenty of which date to the Archaic Period (600-500 BC) (Steingraber 1985: 388). In addition, ten tombs are known to have contained chariot parts, of the two-wheeled type, all dating to the seventh century BC, none of which were painted tombs (Emiliozzi 1999: 323-324).

First, however, an unpainted tomb without a chariot has been described as the 'greatest of all Villanovan burials at Tarquinia' (Hencken 1968: 66). The burial is referred to as 'The Warrior's Tomb' and dates to the second half of the eighth century BC, and is described as a "sarcophagus" tomb from Monterozzi. It is exceptional because of the quantity and wealth of the grave good assemblage, including numerous Greek vases. The bronze work is particularly notable, with a large, elaborately decorated shield, a spear, two axes and a pair of horse bits, as well as a bronze amphora and flask (see Figure VI.2.1 for the axes) (Strøm 1971: 141-149). There were also several fibulae, one of which was a large, pectoral type made of gold; others contained amber and bone. Silver objects, such as a cup, and a silver and bronze signet ring with a scarab, were also found. This tomb illustrates the extensive trade networks present at Tarquinia during this time.

One example of a tomb from the Poggio Gallinaro necropolis, referred to only as a tumulus tomb, is a theatre-shaped chamber tomb with a vestibule, dating to the second quarter of the seventh century BC. Parts of a two-wheeled chariot, including wheel rims, and iron bolts, were found in the vestibule. Within the chamber lay the inhumation burial with two *bucchero* bi-face axes (see Figure VI.2.10) and an ivory plectrum. (Emiliozzi 1999: 324; Colonna 1973: 549, tav. CXXI; Bonghi Jovino 1986: 206, 214; *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 241-242).

C. SETTLEMENT CONTEXTS

The settlement of Tarquinia spread across the large plateau of Pian di Civita, part of which is uninhabited today, but another part of which is covered by the modern town. Little information exists as to the non-ritual settlement evidence. Remains of city walls from the fourth century BC are present, but are believed to have replaced sixth and fifth century defences (Romanelli 1934: 439; 1948: 194-209).

There have been a number of excavations across the Pian di Civita area over the past century. Most of the findings, however, relate to the fourth century BC and later. Excavations on the western end of the plateau, referred to as 'sull' alto della collina', have produced two buildings. The first, Edificio A, is built of rectangular stone

blocks and takes a rectangular form with a cistern (Romanelli 1948: 218-219, fig. 14). This structure may date to the Roman period because of findings of statue fragments from this period in the cistern. Fragments of *bucchero* were also found. The other, Edificio B, consists of a complex arrangement of blocks with a street running through the middle (Romanelli 1948: 220-223, fig. 15). The street is believed to have been a major line of access to the city. Again sherds of *bucchero* were found in the area; however, the structure and street in its latest form have been dated to the fourth to third century BC (Romanelli 1934: 439-442; Romanelli 1948: 218-223)

D. RITUAL CONTEXTS

1. THE CIVITA COMPLEX

An area referred to as a monumental complex has been discovered on the western half of the plateau (Figure IV.37, 38) (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: map 1). It differs greatly, however, in form from the other structures considered monumental complexes, according to the excavators (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 171). This area shows a very long-term development of a ritual area.

The occupation of the Civita area began during the Final Bronze Age, evidenced by findings of a curvilinear hut. The functions of this hut, such as potentially, ritual or habitation, however, have not been identified. During the ninth century BC, a simple enclosure of perishable materials was constructed. Within this area, a skeleton of a young boy, probably eight years old, dating to this period was found in Settore E, area E1 (*Saggio* 6). It is debated as to whether or not it represents a human sacrifice or the burial of a young individual who had acquired a special status (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 41, 159, 171).

During the eighth century the enclosure was replaced by a structure with a stone foundation, thought not to have had a roof. Three infant burials were found in area *alpha 1*, dating to the second half of the eighth century BC. Later during the seventh century BC (or the Orientalising period at Tarquinia), the structure was added to and covered. The excavators adopt a chronology similar to that used by Bietti Sestieri in Latium, so that at Tarquinia, the Orientalising period roughly coincides with the

seventh century and the Archaic period with the sixth century). Another infant burial was located under the northern wall of *edificio beta* (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 159, 171). In addition, two votive deposits from this period were found outside the western wall of Settore C, which will be discussed below.

Bonghi Jovino states that by the mid-seventh century BC, the complex consolidated its function as a significant place within what she calls the 'città-regia', or a kingdom of sorts (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997:180). By this point, the structure consisted of two parallel (but separate) buildings separated by a narrow path; the areas and walls referred to as '*alpha*' relate to the building on the east side of the path (or Sectors E and H), and the areas and walls referred to as '*beta*' relate to the building on the west side of the path (or Sectors A, B, C, D, F) (Figure IV.39) (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 145, plate 17.2). The complex measured approximately 35x32.5 metres. The walls were constructed out of pilasters, or rectangular columns, and stone blocks, a practice which the excavators state has close parallels with the Near and Middle East (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 178).

Towards the end of the Archaic period, or end of the sixth century, the path between the two buildings became a proper street. The monumental nature of the complex continued to be elaborated, while the functions and activities continued unchanged, according to the authors. Fragments of frieze plaques of the VRV banqueting scene and Acquarossa-Tuscania left procession and variant I of the left procession were discovered in association with the structure as well (Chiaramonte Treré 1999: fig 7, although the banqueting scene fragment is not shown). The complex went out of use in the fifth century, and the buildings were filled in, leaving the street remaining (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 183, 205-207, 211).

Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré do not show all of the frieze plaque fragments that they refer to; however, by looking at past excavation reports and other works related to frieze plaques, there seem to be six different frieze plaque scenes present from the Civita site. The first scene includes a procession with pairs of horses and a biga going left, which seems to be the of the Tuscania-Acquarossa type (Andrén

1940: 66, fig. I.1a; Romanelli 1948: 237, no. 48; Cataldi 1993: 208, fig. 1), as well as the Tuscania-Acquarossa left procession variant I (Chiaramonte Treré 1999: fig 7). Another procession scene of pairs of horses going left is also present, this time however, including warriors, at least one of whom holds a sword (Romanelli 1948: 228, no. 11; Cataldi 1993: 208, fig. 3). A procession scene of very different style including warriors walking to the right was also found (Romanelli 1948: 236, no. 43, 44, fig. 17a,c; Cataldi 1993: 208, fig. 2). A second procession scene with a triga and horses going to the right was also present (Andrén 1940: 66, fig. I.1c; Cataldi 1993: 208, fig. 4). The other two styles were not related to processions. One is a banqueting scene of the VRV type (Romanelli 1948: 234, no 9, fig. 25, b and 236, no 42, fig. 25a; Cataldi 1993: 210, fig. 10). The other is a scene of a herd of cows (Romanelli 1948: 227, no 10 fig. 20; Cataldi 1993: 210, fig. 12).

To conclude, Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré argue that the Civita Complex demonstrates the continuity of cult activity, albeit of a different nature from what is believed to have been practised at other Etruscan sites (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 180). The difference is that this was not a temple dedicated to a divinity, but rather a place of sacrifice. The purpose of the complex was to house the reaffirmation of a political system through ritual activity, as opposed to the later development of focusing on one or more divinities through a temple structure. According to the authors, there are no clear parallels in Etruria, but there are in the Near and Middle East and Greece. The presence of a channel (no. 30) is also unique, and may indicate the earliest example of a chthonic cult in Etruria, because of its slight similarity with those found in Sardinia (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 187; though there is also a possible chthonic cult at Orvieto according to Prayon 1993: 27-29).

The nature of the complex has also been discussed in terms of the finds in the foundation pits, which include both burials and votive deposits. First, the five burials (four infants and one child) were found without burial containers or grave goods. It has been suggested, partly based on Pallottino's work, that the burials are the result of human sacrifice. The authors believe that the burials represent propitiation for *prodigium*, and that, consequently, the complex was constructed there largely because

the location symbolised an area of supernatural interaction and atonement (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 158; Pallottino 1989: 7). Second, the two votive deposits just outside the complex indicate that banqueting occurred. The abundance of ceramic vessels in sets shows very definite organisation of banqueting equipment. Pit 284A, the more impressive of the two, because of its bronze items, included two kantharoi drinking vessels. The more modest 284B contained mostly pottery, including *olle*, plates and cups. What is interesting, however, is that the ceramics from both deposits seem to be divided into two groups, represented by the same number and type of vessels but with the two groups each having its own decorative style. Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré have suggested that this indicates the presence of a royal couple who resided, or at least dined, at the complex (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 174-175).

Control of the surrounding territory, by the mid-seventh century BC, according to Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré, is reflected by the development of the necropoleis, including minor necropoleis for separate families, in the distant countryside. They go on to say that it was an agriculture-based economy, and that the division of land led to the emergence of the city-state (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 180).

According to the excavators, the monumentalisation of the complex during the end of the sixth century BC indicates the existence of a *princeps* who held both religious and political power through a lifestyle of regal character (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 198). Extensions and alterations to the complex reflect changes in the political and religious practices, with practices and architecture changing together. Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré state that it is unclear how the complex was integrated into the rest of the settlement, but that it most probably became a symbol of tyrannical power, particularly because of the presence of frieze plaques of the VRV and the Acquarossa-Tuscania types, which illustrate the luxurious lifestyles of aristocrats (Bonghi Jovino, Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 199, 211).

2. ARA DELLA REGINA

The Ara della Regina Temple, briefly mentioned above, is known as an extra-mural temple, according to Edlund, dating to the fourth to third centuries BC (Figure IV.40, 41) (Edlund 1987: 67). There is evidence, however, of an earlier Archaic phase due to an altar base and platform, as well as architectural terracottas, suggesting a mid to late sixth century date (Edlund 1987: 67; Romanelli 1948 238-251, fig. 26, 43). Seven different frieze plaque scenes are associated with this early phase of the temple. Three of the scenes found at Ara della Regina were also found at the Central Structure (see below), including the two VRV scenes of the banqueting scene (Cataldi 1993: 210, no 24, fig. 11) and the procession going left and the other procession going right (Figure IV.42) (Romanelli 1948: 261, no 26 and 260, no 1; Cataldi 1993: 208, no 8,9, fig. 3, 4). Three of the frieze plaque fragment groups relate to other procession scenes, not fully identifiable (Cataldi 1993: fig. 5, 6, 7). Finally, another scene particular to Ara della Regina is very interesting; it is actually a sima and depicts warriors on horseback riding to the left, a warrior with a Phrygian cap lies trampled under the first pair of horses, and a large foot soldier or possible divinity with a spear chases behind the second pair of horses (Figure IV.43) (Cataldi 1993: 212, no 27, fig. 13, 14).

3. THE CENTRAL STRUCTURE

Another large structure was discovered situated on the central-northern edge of the plateau, approximately 400 metres east of the 'monumental complex'. For the sake of clarity, this will be referred to as the 'Central Structure'. It is a large structure with an associated street which dates to the third to second century BC (Figure IV.44). A votive deposit, *Pozzo E*, was found beneath the foundations of a wall of the structure, which contained objects dating to the sixth century. This will be discussed within the Votive Deposit section below. Another area between the gate of edifice C and the blocks of D also contained a large amount of diverse material. The layer is described as a stratum of blackened ash with a collection of finds within (Romanelli 1948: 223). The material dates to the Archaic period, such as tiles, architectural terracottas and vases, including *bucchero* and attic pieces. The architectural terracottas included fragments of two of the frieze plaques from the VRV series. These are the banqueting scene (Romanelli 1948: no. 9, 15, 42, fig. 25), and the procession to the left (Romanelli 1948: no. 48, see also Andrén 1940: pl. 22, no. 75) (Figure IV.45). A

third fragment includes a soldier walking to the right (Figure IV. 46) (Romanelli 1948: 223-237, no. 43, fig. 17c, see also Cataldi 1993: 208, no. 4, fig. 2).

Unfortunately, the form of the Archaic structure is unknown. It is, however, interesting that more than one structure at Tarquinia bore the architectural terracottas from the VRV series. Unlike the monumental complex, this area seems to have had a destruction phase, but continued to be utilised with a different structure, and perhaps different decorations, for several centuries.

4. THE SANTUARIO

An area to the south of Edifice B, mentioned above in the Settlement Contexts section, produced many large stone blocks with fragments of Archaic architectural terracottas and votive objects. Romanelli originally described the area as certainly having a sacred character during the sixth and fifth centuries BC (Romanelli 1934: 439-442; Romanelli 1948: 214-218, fig. 14). In the latest work of Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré, the area is referred to as a 'Santuario' (Figure IV. 47) (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: Map 1). Frieze plaque fragments of a procession scene from the VRV series have been found here, the direction of which is not stated. It is difficult to interpret this area, however, without more information concerning the form of the structure. A votive deposit also associated with the site is called the 'Basamento Semicircolare', and will be describe below in the Votive Deposit section.

5. GRAVISCA

Gravisca, the port site of Tarquinia, was also home to a temple. The earliest remains relate to a stone *sacellum* constructed in 580 BC (Edlund 1987: 76; Colonna 1985a: 141-144; Boitani, Cataldi and Pasquinucci 1975: 216). The structure consisted of two parallel *oikos* structures (edifice B and C), each opening onto a courtyard (cortile A) which held an altar (Figure IV.48). The *oikoi* were built at slightly different times, but became unified as one structure, measuring approximately 9.6x7 m (Torelli 1971: 235-237). There are two current opinions concerning the nature of this temple. Some state that the temple functioned within an emporion, and was used by Greek and other traders from the East (Edlund 1987: 77). Others state that Gravisca was Tarquinia's

port, and therefore the trading and ritual activities directly served the people of Tarquinia, particularly because use of the temple continued after the Greeks abandoned it in 480 BC (Cristofani 1983:34-36, 44-45). The temple was eventually abandoned during the third century BC (Cristofani 1983: 124). Regardless of these differing opinions, Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré think that the temple at Gravisca was very much related to trading, particularly with the Near East, which necessarily helped shape Tarquinia and the Civita complex (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 181).

E. VOTIVE DEPOSITS

1. THE CIVITA COMPLEX

The votive deposits mentioned above, associated with the monumental complex at Civita, dating to the first quarter of the seventh century BC, found in Settore C, area C3 (*edificio beta, fossa 284 A,B*), show the use of both a *lituus* and a ceremonial axe in a votive deposit, within a sacred area (Figure IV.49) (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 61-62, tav. 126). This suggests that the two objects were involved in or related to the ritual activities of the monumental complex, particularly its founding. The trumpet feature of the *lituus* adds another dimension of possibly different roles and functions attached. The votive deposit, however, should be investigated also as a whole entity. The additional findings of a *bucchero* kylix and animal bones indicate that the deposit may be the result of sacrifices and libations (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 65). The ritually 'killed' bronze shield, the other bronze objects mentioned and impasto ware suggest that these were other offerings made to complete the votive deposit. Also noteworthy is the skeleton of the young boy, dating to the end of the ninth century BC, found in Settore E, area E1 (*il Saggio 6*). It has been debated as to whether or not it is the result of human sacrifice or the burial of a young individual who acquired a special status. The structure in question has been termed a 'monumental complex', or a "città regia", which is believed to have combined political and religious functions (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 41, 175).

2. BASAMENTO SEMICIRCOLARE

The 'Basamento Semicircolare' mentioned above is associated with the possible Archaic sanctuary in the south west corner of the plateau, and consists of a mass of votives in a semi-circular mound, over 5 metres high and 28 metres in diameter. Most of the votives date to the Hellenistic period; however, the second and older phase is represented by Archaic votives and architectural details. The Archaic objects include two silen head antefixes and polychrome painted plaque fragments (Romanelli 1948: 214-218).

3. THE CENTRAL STRUCTURE

The votive deposit, Pozzo E, under a foundation wall of the central structure contained pottery and architectural terracottas from the sixth century. The architectural terracottas included frieze plaque fragments of steers walking to the right (Figure IV.50) (Romanelli 1948: 227, fig. 20). The deposit was 70cm deep, and may be the foundation deposit created during the reconstruction period, after the sixth century BC.

4. ARA DELLA REGINA

It is difficult to determine whether or not the Ara della Regina temple had a votive deposit from its earliest Archaic existence. A fragment of a statue dating to the late sixth or early fifth century BC may have formed part of a deposit created during its restructuring and redecoration phase (Figure IV.51) (Romanelli 1948: 256). Romanelli states that there is a possibility that more votive objects representing a wider chronology did exist, but they have not been found yet (Romanelli 1948: 256-257).

F. CONCLUSIONS

As with Caere, the existence of one main necropolis for any one time period for Tarquinia, adjacent to the habitation area, indicates a certain level of integration, and yet competition, amongst its elites. It is difficult to explore this more specifically because of the poor contextual data surrounding the grave goods. The development of three ritual areas is also interesting. The monumental complex at Civita faded out of use during the fifth century BC, shortly after the construction of Ara della Regina.

The central complex also seems to have had a sixth century BC phase that included figured frieze plaques shared by Ara della Regina; it is uncertain exactly which frieze plaques were used at the Civita complex. The central complex continued after an apparent destruction phase, and was maintained until the second century BC. The development of Gravisca also added to the ritual sphere, regardless of how directly or otherwise it was controlled by Tarquinia.

At the end of the sixth century, while the Civita Complex was becoming monumentalised, Greek influence on rituals was appearing elsewhere at Tarquinia, evidenced by the construction of the Ara della Regina Temple, near the south end of the plateau's largest area. This may demonstrate that different rituals were beginning to be practised and different divinities were beginning to be worshipped at Tarquinia, which may also relate to different power structures arising. Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré state that the Civita Complex became a symbol of tyrannical power, demonstrated by the presence of frieze plaques of the VRV and the Acquarossa-Tuscania types (1997: 199, 211). While the Civita Complex and Ara della Regina seem very different, it is unclear that tyrannical power is the most appropriate way of describing the context of the former.

It is possible that a progression in the deposition of votives can be seen at Tarquinia, first with the foundation type deposits at the Civita complex, eventually followed by a series of deposits that seem to be related to the destruction or restructuring of the ritual areas across the plateau. The Basamento Semicircolare, associated with the possible south-western sanctuary, Pozzo E, under the foundations of the central complex, and possibly the deposit at Ara della Regina, represent a new desire to 'process' highly significant elements of sacred structures that, for some reason, were no longer needed. Eventually, a more open and continual type of votive deposit with purpose-made votives was created at the Ara della Regina temple. Unfortunately, it is impossible to say if Ara della Regina contained a votive deposit during the Archaic period, but it did at least after its reconstruction during the fourth century BC.

VEII

A. INTRODUCTION

Veii was one of the largest Etruscan settlements and prospered for several centuries. It reached its pinnacle in the fifth century BC, but its entire development as a settlement lasted from the late tenth century BC, until after its supposed ‘destruction’ in 396 BC by the Romans. After this, settlement on the plateau appears to have continued on a much smaller scale, and it later became a Roman *municipium* by 1 BC (Ward-Perkins 1961: 23).

The location of the city in southern Etruria, just sixteen kilometres north of Rome and in the vicinity of the Tiber, played an important role in its development. Veii is positioned on a large tuff plateau that rises above the valley and is almost entirely encircled by streams (Figure IV.52). Intensive surveys and sporadic excavations have yielded findings of at least two major temples, some habitation structures, enormous votive deposits, an extensive cuniculus system and no less than ten necropoleis surrounding the plateau (Ward-Perkins 1961). It is amongst the earliest Etruscan sites to begin the transformation from using cremation burial practices to inhumation burial practices.

Veii first became inhabited during the Villanovan period. After a considerable amount of surveying across the plateau in the 1950’s and 1960’s, J.B. Ward-Perkins, as the director of the British School at Rome, believed that the plateau during Villanovan times consisted of small villages scattered across the area, only loosely associated with each other (Ward-Perkins 1961: 22). These villages were located in disparate areas usually along the edges of the plateau, at a distance from each other. Recently, the British School at Rome has restarted the Tiber Valley Project, which included a re-evaluation of the survey material collected by Ward-Perkins (Patterson, et al. 2000: 395-403; Patterson, et al. 2004: 1-6). The re-evaluation of nearly 6,000 sherds of diagnostic pottery resulted in a clearer picture of Veii’s development. The result was the appearance of three main clusters of settlement at the Campetti, Macchiagrande and Comunità areas during the Villanovan period, with a light density

of material (see also Moretti Sgubini 2001 for the most recent excavation reports for Veii). These clusters remained in the Etruscan period, with an increase in the amount of material and number of find spots (Figure IV.53) (Patterson, et al. 2000: fig. 2; the phrase 'Iron Age' is used instead of 'Villanovan Period'). Gilda Bartoloni has also suggested that Veii originated as two villages on the plateau, because of the disparate distribution of the earliest necropoleis from the ninth and eighth centuries BC, with Grotta Gramiccia, Casale del Fosso and Quattro Fontanili to the north, and Valle La Fata and Monte Campanile to the south-west (Bartoloni 2001a: 89).

Significantly, these areas also coincide with the three earliest roads leading from the plateau, dating back to Villanovan times; these were the road to Nepi and the Monti Sabatini, the road to Rome from the Valle la Fata Gate and the road to Capena from the North-East gate (Ward-Perkins 1961: 3). These routes continued to be used and improved, so that the later Etruscan, and even Roman, roads and gates followed these natural courses as well. It is also interesting that distinct necropoleis were established during the Villanovan period, possibly corresponding with separate settlement areas on the plateau above, and along the developing roads. Like the roads, the cemeteries continued to be used during the succeeding periods, after the inhabitants of the Veientine plateau became a more unified community (Ward-Perkins 1961: 22). The small, nearby plateau to the west of the central Veii plateau also contains evidence of habitation from the Final Bronze Age (Bartoloni, et al. 2001: 5).

B. FUNERARY CONTEXTS

The number of burials at Veii, which survive from the end of the tenth to the end of the fourth century BC, reach the thousands. Interestingly, the forms of burial changed more than once, in ways that partly distinguish Veii from other Etruscan sites. During the early Villanovan period, these were simple urn burials in pits, or *tombe a pozzo*. These consist, most often, of a biconical urn holding the ashes of the deceased, covered with a ceramic bowl or helmet, and accompanied by grave goods such as razors, fibulae and spindle whorls. The urns and goods are placed in a small circular pit either unlined or within a large stone vessel. There are no clear signs of differentiated status between burials of this type at most Etruscan sites. At Veii,

however, a certain trends towards differentiation may be visible. At Veii's Grotta Gramiccia necropolis, out of twenty burials that are believed to be male, dating to the tenth century BC, 60% (12) include a helmet lid on the biconical urn, 40% (4) of these also had one fibula each, and only one contained a bracelet (Berardinetti 1994: 8). The inclusion of helmets in the burials may have been one of the first means of indicating elevated or special social statuses, and other items included alongside the helmets may indicate different accumulated amounts of wealth.

Trench graves, or *tombe a fossa*, gradually developed at the end of the ninth century. Many of these consisted of simple rectangular trenches containing either cremations in urns or inhumations with the corpse extended. These became more elaborate over time, with small *loculi* or niches cut into the sides of the trench to store grave goods. Gradually, inhumation practices became more widespread, and cremation burials became increasingly rare. The corpses seem to be dismembered in many cases, with only the teeth surviving well (Colini 1919: 6). The trenches and *loculi* became larger and deeper in most cases during the Orientalising phase, sometimes with signs of the trenches previously being decorated with red colouring (Colini 1919: 6). These gradually developed into full chamber tombs by the end of the eighth century BC, with the inclusion of long *dromoi* with steps leading to the chambers, initially without benches or *loculi*. In addition, a small number of enormous tumuli, or 'princely burials', from the seventh century BC were placed apart from the rest of the necropoleis and the city itself. From this period on, chamber tombs containing inhumation burials represent the majority of burials at Veii, with the exception of some chamber tombs containing cremation burials during the late sixth to fifth centuries BC (Colini 1919: 5). There are even a few exceptional cases where both burial forms are used within chamber tombs at Veii (Lanciani 1889: 11).

The various burial forms and burial rites overlap each other chronologically. At no point after the early ninth century BC was a single burial practice universally practised at Veii. It is intriguing to consider the outliers in each period. There is a small number of burials from each time period which uses either the previously popular, 'traditional' burial form, while a small number of others marks the beginning of a new trend with a new burial practice.

1. THE NECROPOLEIS

The ten main necropolis areas contain a vast number of burials of all of the types described above (Figure IV.54). The necropoleis were each used for long periods of time; some span the entire duration of Veii's Etruscan existence.

a) GROTTA GRAMICCIA

All burial types are present in this necropolis (Ward-Perkins 1961: 42; Colini 1919: 6; Berardinetti 1994: fig. 2).

b) CASALE DEL FOSSA

Only a single Villanovan *pozzo* tomb has been found; other shaft graves are believed to be much later. The majority of burials, however, are *fossa* tombs, many with votive *loculi* for grave goods, but the overwhelming number instead contain large sepulchral *loculi* for the remains of the deceased. This practice of sepulchral *loculi* is also found at Narce, a contemporary settlement found outside 'Etruria proper' (Colini 1919: 6). The chamber tombs are found along the slope with the oldest just under the ridge followed by the later ones down slope, facing the town (Ward-Perkins 1961: 42; Colini 1919: 6; Drago 1994: fig. 7).

c) RISERVA DELL'OLIVETO/ POZZUOLO

There are remains of two Etruscan necropoleis here. One of these occupies a ridge of high ground near the Fosso Piordo and is sometimes referred to as *Riserva del Bagno*; the other occupies an area east of the old Formello road, possibly related to different routes to Caere, and is sometimes referred to as *Oliveto Grande* (Ward-Perkins 1961:43). The *Riserva del Bagno* area contains rock cut tombs along the ridge, which are possibly eighth and seventh century (Berardinetti 1994: 6). There do not seem to be any published accounts of the area as a whole (Ward-Perkins 1961:43); however, the painted *Tomba delle Anatre* from this area has been published (Steingraber 1985: 374). The more southern area of *Oliveto Grande* contains large chamber tombs of the seventh century BC and possibly later (Colini 1919: 7), most of which follow a road which later became part of the Via Cassia. There are also two large tumuli in the area (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43).

d) CASSALACCIO (TORRACCIA)

Twenty-one tombs are reported as being excavated in two distinct groups, including seven *fossa* tombs, six chamber tombs and eight 'courtyard tombs' (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43 citing Vighi 1935: 39-68). A long time-span is covered at this necropolis, possibly seventh to third centuries BC. A small group of 'Etrusco-Campanian' wares, which dates from the fourth to third centuries BC, indicates some continuity after the 'destruction' of Veii in 396 BC (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43).

e) VALLE LA FATA

Both Villanovan (ninth century BC) *pozzo* tombs and *fossa* tombs are found in this area, this time with a different topographical organisation, with the *pozzo* tombs located in the valley bottom (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43; Colini 1919: 7).

f) MONTE CAMPANILE

A group of chamber tombs is located here on a high crest where the route to Rome also ran. These were robbed and have been only partially described in one publication (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43; Colini 1919: 7).

g) MACCHIA DELLA COMUNITÀ

This is a large necropolis spanning several time periods with ninth century *pozzo* tombs, *fossa* tombs with votive loculi from the eighth century, and over seventy-five chamber tombs, most of them from the seventh century. One of the chamber tombs, however, contained material from the third century (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43; Colini 1919: 7).

h) VACCHERECCIA

The majority of tombs found here is characterised by a largely homogenous collection of impasto wares and ceramics similar to those used at Narce and Falerii. Most of the tombs date from the ninth to seventh centuries BC, with the exception of one Villanovan *pozzo* tomb, and one tumulus found outside the formal area near two 'courtyard tombs'. The *pozzo* tombs were clustered on top of a prominent knoll with the tombs from succeeding periods radiating down slope in view of the town. The

excavations were carried out in 1889, and since then the area has been under heavy cultivation (Ward-Perkins 1961: 43-46, citing Palm 1935: 335-337).

i) MONTE MICHELE

This necropolis is situated opposite the North-East (Capena) Gate between two Etruscan roads. An enormous amount of tomb robbing has occurred in this area. One of the main systematic records of excavation is that of the extraordinary Campana Tomb (Ward-Perkins 1961:46; citing Canina 1874: 75). Also notable are tombs that are believed to post-date 396 BC, but are *pozzo* tombs (Ward-Perkins 1961: 45-46; Stefani 1929: 342), as well as more ‘courtyard tombs’ (Ward-Perkins 1961: 46). Fortunately, many excavations have been carried out in this necropolis in the past few decades, resulting in a number of well-published tombs (cf. Boitani 1982).

j) QUATTRO FONTANILI (PICAZZANO)

This necropolis is immediately north of Veii, bounded by the Formello road, the Fossa della Valchetta and one of its tributaries, creating a triangular-shaped piece of land. *I Quattro Fontanili* usually refers to the cemetery area at the apex of the area to distinguish it from the rest. Antiquarians heavily ‘explored’ the area in the mid 1800’s, and in the 1970’s it was systematically excavated and published (Guidi 1993). There are, however, mostly *fossa* and chamber tombs from the seventh century BC and on. The *pozzo* tombs from the Villanovan and Orientalising periods were found on the upper crested area, with the later burials located down slope (Ward-Perkins 1961: 46).

2. PARTICULAR TOMBS

A small number of tombs that are different from the majority, with regard to their grave goods or their architectural tomb structure, provides crucial insights into the form and expression of special statuses through burial rites.

a) TOMB 871 ‘del Guerriero’ from Casale del Fosso

This tomb dates to the last quarter of the eighth century BC. Unfortunately, the tomb itself has not been properly published; only its assemblage has been fully treated. Tomb 871 was most probably a *fossa* tomb, and it provides one of the earliest

examples of a wealthy warrior burial at Veii. It consisted of a male inhumation burial with a complete set of equipment for a warrior, including: a bronze shield, a 75 cm high crested helmet, a piece of bronze body armour with Subgeometric relief decoration, an iron sword in a bronze sheath with amber inlay, an iron spear and two bronze horse bits (Strøm 1971: 140). One of the most interesting finds is a spectacular *lituus* with a gold knob and a wooden staff covered in gold foil (Colini 1919: 12). The tomb also included another staff of hollow bronze which may have been a fan and a large situla with a lion's head imported from Assyria (Strøm 1971: 140), as well as a bronze footstool and parts of a two-wheel chariot (Emiliozzi 1999: 324, no. 148).

The original excavator, Colini, called this a priestly tomb because it contained interesting parallels with the *Salii* priests of Rome. The members of this college of priests adopted the uniform of the Archaic Italian foot soldier, and were identified by their large conical, pointed hats, long shields and breast plates each held a sword in one hand and a staff in the other (OCD 1996: *salii*). The origin of this college was traditionally traced back to a king of Veii, Morrius (Colini 1919: 12).

b) TOMB 5, Monte Michele

This tomb dates to the second quarter of the seventh century, and is located approximately 200 metres away from the true Monte Michele area with five other tombs positioned along the old road to Capena (Figure IV.55). The group of tombs spans less than a century, and was probably grouped together for significant reasons. The structure and contents of Tomb 5, the earliest of this group, are extraordinary for Veii during this period. It is a rectangular chamber tomb with two small cells on either side of the long dromos. It contained four burials of mixed burial rites and sexes. The chief excavator, Boitani, believes that a nuclear family is represented in the tomb, which is exceptional for this period (with the majority of Orientalising chamber tombs containing one or two burials) (Boitani 1985: 535).

The burial in the right cell was a cremation burial of a male, aged between 18-20 years old. The age was indicated by bone analysis and the sex was suggested by the presence of spear tips as grave goods, along with pottery. The burial in the left cell

was an inhumation of a small child, with the knees slightly bent. It was found with only three rectangular sheets of lead, which might have secured a cover placed over the body (Boitani 1985: 540-542).

Two burials are believed to have existed in the large, main chamber, the contents of which have been badly damaged by natural causes. On the left side of the chamber, grave goods indicating a female burial included: three spindle whorls (1 iron, 2 impasto), two silver fibulae (one of which also contained amber) and small bits of amber and glass paste, as well as fine vases. No traces of bone were found; however an empty space on the ground suggested that an inhumation burial had once been placed there, but had since disintegrated; chemical analysis of the soil was planned. Other objects in the centre of the tomb were believed to be associated with the possible female inhumation, including two iron knives with bone handles, thirteen impasto vases, eight *buccheri*, two impasto rosso, and more (Boitani 1985: 540, 543).

On the right side of the main chamber was an incredible display of wealth, and the burial identified as a 'princely' burial by Boitani (1985: 545). The burial was a cremation in an extremely damaged bronze hut-urn, believed to be a mature male, mostly due to the character of the grave goods. The burnt bones inside had been wrapped in a cloth with a few personal ornaments of precious metals, and placed in a semi-anatomical position with the head above a few vertebrae, part of the pelvis and a femur. The hut-urn was probably placed on a chariot of four iron wheels with a wooden frame covered in bronze stamped sheets that totalled over five metres in length. The chariot had collapsed, smashing and scattering the majority of grave goods on this side of the chamber. Some of the other grave goods included a dagger, spears two metres in length, four javelins, a pair of iron horsebits, banqueting equipment and ceramics. The most extraordinary item was a sceptre or *bastone* consisting of a wooden staff topped with a bronze knob with iron details and a bottom end covered in silver. There was also a bronze fan and an unidentifiable tronco-conical ivory object decorated with winged sphinxes (possibly imported), and two impasto shields (Boitani 1985: 545-549)

c) TOMBA CAMPANA, Monte Michele

This tomb dates to c.600 BC, and is the most ostentatious tomb found at Veii so far (Figure IV.56). It is a two-chamber tomb, which also has a long *dromos* with two small side chambers. The first main chamber has a low-vaulted ceiling and two funerary couches on either side containing inhumations; the second chamber has a flat ceiling and a continuous bench area. Incredibly ornate paintings covered the walls, in the first chamber with images of sphinges, men riding spotted panthers and horses and a man holding an axe, while the second chamber has six shields painted on the back wall. The tomb had been partly plundered, but still contained a huge amount of fine pottery, including banqueting equipment and vases, as well as impasto braziers. Other items found included a bronze helmet, fragments of bronze armour, a spear, a bronze candelabrum and several bronze mirrors (Steingraber 1985: 374-375).

C. NON-RITUAL SETTLEMENT CONTEXTS

1. DOMESTIC STRUCTURES

Evidence of domestic architecture has been difficult to find, largely due to the use of timber frames and mud-brick or wattle and daub walls even until the fourth century BC (Ward-Perkins 1961: 27). Findings of stone foundations and domestic pottery have helped locate some of the early areas of Etruscan settlement.

Several Early Iron Age huts were discovered and partially excavated in the Portonaccio area. They are located on the ledge immediately above the Portonaccio temple site. One of the huts had been rebuilt several times, one of which was a large oval structure measuring 9.3 x 5.7 metres (Figure IV.57) (Stefani 1953: 102-103, fig. 69; Ward-Perkins 1961:23).

Another partial structure was found in 1889 by Lanciani and excavated in 1917 by Stefani, this time in the Macchia Grande area, near the north-east edge of the plateau (Figure IV.58). It consists of five rooms with stone block foundations. Different orientations and an absence of interlocking stones indicate at least two building phases. The earliest of these phases, represented by rooms 1 and 2, dates to the eighth to seventh centuries BC. Room 2 contains a large 'chimney' hearth. The rooms

contained two *dolia*, a *bucchero olpe*, and a piece of *aes rude* (Stefani 1922: 379-382).

Fortunately, the area by the North-West Gate at Veii has been excavated, and found to have had a continuous occupation sequence from the Villanovan period (Figure IV.59) (Ward-Perkins 1959: 38-79). Beneath the fifth century BC rampart and gate at the north-west corner of Veii, three building phases were identified. The lack of *in situ* finds make it difficult to identify the functions of the structures; however, this area demonstrates the development of particular building techniques employed at Veii. The earliest building phase, from the Villanovan Period, consisted of a series of postholes and a curvilinear gully dug into the tuff bedrock, creating a timber building or enclosure (Ward-Perkins 1959: 50, fig. 5, 6a). During the successive building phase, the pre-existing postholes were filled with impasto wares, and new postholes were created on a rectilinear plan (Ward-Perkins 1959: 58, fig. 5, 6b). The third building phase, from the sixth century BC, contained stone rectilinear foundations with, most probably, a mud-brick or timber superstructure; it consisted of two rooms with a portico along one side (Ward-Perkins 1959: 62, fig. 6c, 9). Finally, at some point, this structure was also removed to make way for the fifth century rampart wall.

In the Piazza d'Armi area, three rectilinear buildings with foundations of large tuff blocks were partially excavated. The structures adjoined leaving an open space around a large, sunken oval enclosure, where the ancient *arx*, or citadel, is believed to have been located (Ward-Perkins 1961:32; Stefani 1944: 181-186, 225-228).

2. OTHER CONSTRUCTION FEATURES

Other construction features at Veii illustrate that large amounts of labour for massive construction projects were organised by the end of the sixth to the early fifth century BC. By this period, a circuit of defensive ramparts and walls stretched almost entirely around the plateau, with the exclusion of the Piazza d'Armi extension. A few unfortified edges of the main plateau seem to be naturally defensible areas, not needing artificial improvements. Some places, the North-West gate for instance, had a rampart that is 20 metres wide, with a tuff block wall 5-6 metres high (Ward-Perkins 1961:32).

An impressive system of *cuniculi*, that is, tunnels dug into the tuff bedrock to convey water for domestic and agricultural purposes, existed at Veii. These are on average approximately 1.6 m high and can be several hundred metres long, and used to supply clean water to the habitation areas, or divert natural water-courses surrounding the plateau in order to prevent flooding, or to irrigate dry lands for agriculture. The majority of *cuniculi* at Veii is thought to be from the sixth century or possibly even earlier. It is difficult to date the *cuniculi*; however, in one place a stratigraphic sequence is evident by the Ponte Sodo, which cuts into the earlier *cuniculus*, positioned under the fifth century defences (Ward-Perkins 1961:32).

D. RITUAL CONTEXTS

1. PIAZZA D'ARMI TEMPLE

The temple on the Piazza d'Armi shows a long-term transformation of ritual space. Its first phase, during the ninth to seventh centuries BC, consisted of Early Iron Age huts with decorated Villanovan pottery, although it is unclear if this phase was ritual in nature (Figure IV.60) (Stefani 1944: 228-290). The second phase, from the end of the seventh to the middle of the sixth century, consisted of a rectangular structure facing south-east, approximately 15.35 x 8.07 metres, referred to as an *oikos* temple, with a foundation consisting of large tufa blocks and possibly footings for timber uprights in the centre (Figure IV.61) (Ward-Perkins 1961: 32; Stefani 1944: 228-290). This structure continued to be augmented, with the surrounding area becoming more urbanised during the third phase, from the middle of the sixth century to the early fifth century (Bartoloni 2001b: 30-31).

Rooftop terracottas, tiles and two types of friezes are dated to the first half of the sixth century (Ward-Perkins 1961: 32; Andr n 1940: 8). At least two decorative phases were identified, both of which included frieze plaques with procession scenes (Bartoloni 2001b: 29). The second phase includes a frieze plaque with a scene of warriors on horseback moving to the left, and another procession with a hoplite, biga and a warrior on horseback going right (similar to those from Tuscania), dated to the middle of the sixth century (Figure IV.62) (Bartoloni 2001b: 34, fig. I.E.12, I.E.11;

Andrén 1940: 8-9, Stefani 1944: 252ff.). There were also fragments of plaques depicting a panther and another with other felines (Figures IV.63, 64) (Bartoloni 2001b: 33, figures I.E.9, I.E.10). A plaque with a panther has also been found in the Regia of the Roman forum, and feline plaques have also been found at the Portonaccio area of Veii (see Downey 1993 for the Rome fragment, and Stefani 1953: 58, fig. 32.1 for the Portonaccio fragment).

A small rectangular chamber with an associated cistern is attached to the temple, as well as another cistern to the side. Andrén believed that the Piazza d'Armi temple showed evidence of continued maintenance during the third and second centuries (Andrén 1940: 10). Bartoloni, however, has suggested that from the end of the fourth century, the primary activities on the Piazza d'Armi plateau were agricultural. A street measuring 100 metres long was also discovered, with three structures dating to the first half of the sixth century situated along it (Bartoloni 2001b: 30-31).

2. CAMPETTI MONUMENTAL COMPLEX

In the Campetti area, on the north side of the plateau, the outer walls of a large building constructed of large tufa blocks, approximately 20x17 metres in size, have been located (Figure IV.65) (Pallottino 1938-39: 402-403, Ward-Perkins 1961: 31). Material inside includes ceramic fragments dating to the middle of the eighth century BC, and others dating from the end of the seventh to the beginning of the sixth century BC (Fusco and Cerasuolo 2001: 9, cat. I.B.8-12). The earliest part of the structure has been dated from the end of the seventh to the beginning of the sixth century BC, with a succeeding phase dating to the mid-sixth and beginning of the fifth century BC (Fusco and Cerasuolo 2001: 9, 10; Torelli and Pohl 1973: 61-63).

It is believed to have been used for ritual purposes until it was destroyed by fire in the mid-fifth century BC. The ancient surface level was covered by a burnt layer containing ceramics and animal bones (Fusco and Cerasuolo 2001: 10). On top of this layer was a large deposit of votive terracottas and architectural terracottas, mostly from the sixth and fifth century BC, but some of a later date (Figure IV.66) (Pallottino 1938-39: 403, Ward-Perkins 1961: 31; Torelli 1973: 52-57). Two fragments of an architectural terracotta frieze plaque show a procession scene, like those found in the

Piazza d'Armi area, dated to the first half of the sixth century BC (Fusco and Cerasuolo 2001: 14, cat. I.B.18). Other fragments have been identified as belonging to the VRV series, including a small fragment possibly depicting soldiers on horseback riding to the left (Figure IV.67) (Fusco and Cerasuolo 2001: 14, cat. I.B.19), as well as VRV procession to the left and the chariot racing scenes (Figures IV.68-70) (Andr n 1940: 10, Giglioli 1923: pl. 3.1, 3.2).

3. COMUNIT  TEMPLE

Beneath a Roman villa lies what is believed to be a large Etruscan structure, probably dating to the seventh and sixth centuries (Figure IV.71, multiple periods combined) (Belelli Marchesini 2001: 23, Ward-Perkins 1961: 31, Lanciani 1889: 63). Its position on the crest of the plateau overlooking the Piazza d'Armi area suggests that the structure had some importance (Ward-Perkins 1961: 27). At least three connecting rooms and a portico have been identified (Belelli Marchesini 2001: 24). The architectural terracottas date to the sixth and fifth centuries, including a head of a female statue (Figure IV.72) and two different antefixes of female heads (Figure IV.73) (Belelli Marchesini 2001: fig. I.D.8, I.D.10, I.D.11). A small fragment of a frieze plaque showing three horses trotting to the right, similar to the VRV style plaques, was also found (Figure IV.74) (Andr n 1940: 10; Giglioli 1923: 169, pl. 33). Also, a statue fragment of an arm entwined by a snake and holding a dish and votive material indicates that this was the site of a ritual structure. Ward-Perkins states that this area was possibly "the location of one of the city's principal sanctuaries" (1961:27). Torelli has also questioned if this area was the arx of Veii containing the temple of Juno Regina, as mentioned by Livy (5.21) (Torelli 1982: 124-128).

4. PORTONACCIO TEMPLE

The Portonaccio Temple at Veii is one of the most famous Etruscan temples (Figure IV.75). It is situated on the eastern half of a low platform outside the Etruscan city walls, surrounded by steep cliffs, facing east (Stefani 1953: 29-112). A precinct wall encloses a trapezoidal area containing the temple, adjacent pool and altar platform. At least two *cuniculi* run from the higher edge of the main plateau, most probably carrying water from the Piordo stream to the temple area. The central area of the precinct has been badly damaged by the quarrying of the cliff sides below; however, a

cistern has been found to exist in this area (Ward-Perkins 1961: 30; Colonna 2001: 40). The outer walls and the front cella wall are original. However, the three-cella form as now shown on the site is a reconstruction of how the interior may have been planned; it could possibly have had a single cella plan instead (Ward-Perkins 1961: 30).

The results of several excavations over many years have recently been unified for a more coherent chronology of the area, which divided the development into phases (Colonna 2001: 37-44). The first phase represents the beginning of cult activity, and coincides with the first half of the seventh century BC. No physical *sacellum* existed during this period; instead there was a so-called 'casa dei sacerdoti', or house of the priests, in the west area of the precinct and a large votive deposit in the east area (Stefani 1953: 103, fig. 70.B; Colonna 2001: 40, fig. 2). The so-called house of the priests was an *oikos* with a rectangular cella; it contained animal bones possibly indicating a residential function, and fragments of a frieze plaque with a feline motif, like those from the third Regia at Rome (Colonna 2001: 39; Andr n 1971: 4, note 21; Stefani 1953: 57, fig. 32.1). The votive deposit in the eastern area is considered one of the most important from the Orientalising to early Archaic periods, containing mostly ceramics indicating worship of female divinities, *Menrva* among others (Colonna 2001: 39).

The second phase is much shorter in duration (540/530-510/500 BC). This period saw the beginning of monumentalisation of the area (Colonna 2001: 39). An *oikos sacellum* was built in the eastern area, and the former votive deposit sealed. An altar and portico were constructed near the eastern *sacellum*; painted simas were also found. A large cistern, constructed in the centre of the area, dividing the sanctuary area between the house structure and the *Menrva* shrine dates to this period (Colonna 2001: 40). Slightly after this, a large *oikos* with an elongated plan was constructed over the site of the destroyed house of the priests. This is believed to have had cult purposes, and is similar in size to the Piazza d'Armi structure.

This *oikos* was decorated with of all six scenes from the VRV series. Stefani, the excavator, identified two of the fragments as belonging to the series, and Gantz later

identified another six fragments as also matching (Figure IV.76) (Stefani 1953: 57, fig. 32; Gantz 1975: 5-6; Colonna 2001: 40). The fragments of the frieze plaques were found in the later pool structure, probably discarded during the rebuilding (Stefani 1953: 56-5, fig. 32; Colonna 2001: 40). There were also antefixes of female heads of an ionic-attic style (Figure IV.77) (Colonna 1985a: 101, note 5.1.B.2; Colonna 1987: 28, fig. 65; Colonna 2001: 40). This building is described not as a 'temple', but as a *regia* with residential functions for the head of a *gens*, where priests could maintain the area. The ideology within the frieze plaques expresses the concerns of aristocrats, rather than anything else, according to Colonna. This period is largely devoid of votives or inscriptions, except for votive statues of *kouroi*, Hermes, Turms, Heracles and Menrva (Colonna 2001: 40; Andr n 1940: 4).

The entire temenos was radically restructured during the third phase, at the end of the sixth century BC (Colonna 2001: 40). The private residence was destroyed and replaced by a medium-sized temple. A pool was constructed next to it, which was fed by a *cuniculus*. This is identified as the first temple of the Tuscan Order, as described by Vitruvius. The terracotta decorations here, as well as Pyrgi Temple B, show the second phase of architectural terracottas developing, including antefixes of gorgons, silens, maenads and Achelous (Colonna 2001: 41; Andr n 1940: 5). The acroterial statues that adorned the roof might have been made by more than one artist. The slightly later Heracles and *Menrva* statues in three-quarters life-size were votive objects deposited into the eastern deposit at the *sacellum*. In addition, a temenos wall was constructed, the area raised in general and the road system into the area was improved.

Impressive life-size terracotta statues of Apollo, Heracles, Hermes, Latona and others, which once stood on the ridgepole, were discovered, along with terracotta antefixes which date to the late sixth century BC (Figure IV.78, 79) (Spivey 1997: 63-65). The nearby altar platform contained a large votive deposit, and may have been re-built more than once (Stefani 1953: 29-112). A cult of *Menrva* is suggested by a number of dedicatory inscriptions to the goddess (Edlund 1987: 66) (see below in 'Votive Deposit' and 'Inscription' sections).

Colonna states that the form of the structure and the decorations are typical of aristocratic display, and that it functioned as a *regia*, with the head of a *gens* overseeing the priestly activities, including an oracle of *Menrva*. Towards the end of the sixth century, the house of the priests was demolished, and replaced with the temple structure and adjoining pool now known as the Portonaccio Temple, as mentioned at the beginning of this section (Colonna 2001: 40; Ward Perkins 1961: 30).

E. VOTIVE DEPOSITS

At least three major votive deposits have been found on the Veii plateau. One already mentioned above was found scattered above the remains of the Campetti structure. The majority of the votives are from the fifth and sixth century and consist of very mixed items, including: seated couples, warriors, youths carrying lyres, women's heads and anatomical votives. Architectural terracottas from the late sixth century BC and pottery from the fifth and sixth centuries were also present (Ward-Perkins 1961: 31; Pallottino 1938-39: 403).

The largest votive deposit found at Veii so far, was found outside the entrance to the Piazza d'Armi (Lanciani 1889: 30-31, 63-65). It consisted of nearly 2,000 complete pieces of Hellenistic material, a quarter of which were veiled female heads and a high proportion of anatomical votives; because they are from a later period, they are not pertinent to this study.

A large votive deposit was found by the altar platform outside the Portonaccio temple (Pallottino 1939-40: 18). The majority of the votives dates to the late sixth to early fifth centuries, including much imported pottery, jewellery and other objects of precious metal (Stefani 1953: 41,81). A small number of later votives suggests that worship continued in the area after 396 BC (Ward-Perkins 1961: 30; Santangelo 1948: 454-464). A *bucchero* cup dating to the first half of the sixth century with a dedicatory inscription to the goddess *Menrva* is one of the earliest known votives with a dedicatory inscription. The inscription on the handle includes the name of the donor *Velthur Tulumne* (Edlund 1987: 66; Giglioli 1930: 335-345; Pallottino 1939: 457; *TLE* 36). This is also interesting because the family name of *tulumne* appears in

different accounts for several centuries. One of these citations even includes Livy's account of *Lars Tolumnius*, the 'king' of Veii in 437 BC (mentioned above, Livy 4.17, also see Edlund 1987: 66, but she uses the date 428 BC).

The family name of *Tulumne* appearing on a votive indicates that by the first half of the sixth century BC, donating onomastic votives at temples was a rare aristocratic practice that would become a more common practice in later centuries. Also, the use of one's name may make a votive donation a public act, particularly if the votives were displayed within the temple for a substantial period of time before being buried, as is commonly believed. It is possible that votive donations at temples, especially with inscribed names identifying the donor, played an active role in defining social roles, such as aristocratic individuals seeking or attempting to maintain authority of some sort. This practice could have been a strong means of creating a public connection between oneself and a divinity to build prestige.

F. CONCLUSIONS

Multiple necropoleis for most periods surround the plateau at Veii, suggesting a decentralised or not-fully integrated population (for most periods), particularly prior to the end of the sixth century BC. These signs have parallels in the settlement evidence with the early pottery scatters showing separate clusters. Similarly, in the ritual sphere, the construction of four structures during the seventh century at disparate locations across the plateau also suggests different groups at work. The destruction of two of them shows some degree of struggle, although one of the sites, Campetti, continued to be used as a sacred location. Portonaccio was reconstructed three times, and Piazza d'Armi also received occasional reworking; both of these sites lasted for several centuries. These findings support the idea that some Etruscan settlements during this period were a collection of separate communities, and may indicate the continued importance of kinship groups believed to have been crucial during the Final Bronze Age, particularly in Latium (Smith 1996: 53; Bietti Sestieri 1992: 209).

The structures at Portonaccio and Campetti are believed by their excavators to have been constructed in accordance with the Vitruvian description of Tuscan temples. Interestingly, all of the ritual structures had architectural decorations that indicated that they held connections with other ritual structures throughout Etruria and Latium (Andr  n 1940:10, although he does not mention Comunit  ). Campetti, Comunit   and Portonaccio all bore plaques from the VRV series, and Piazza d'Armi had plaques that were very similar to an example from Tuscania. The VRV series frieze plaques may have been produced at Portonaccio because it had all six scenes (see Chapter II and V for discussions).

The endurance of Portonaccio and Piazza d'Armi in their restructured and redecorated guises may indicate a stabilisation in the ritual sphere. *Cuniculi* from the sixth century or earlier, and walls from the late sixth or early fifth century BC, however, indicate that some amount of centralisation was occurring, at least in relation to defense and maintenance of the site.

Many of the conclusions drawn by the excavators concerning Veii are based on assumptions about social statuses that may have existed. Descriptions of burials representing warriors and *Salii* priests assume that weapons and types of helmets are enough to identify rank and status. The ritual sphere has also produced these types of conclusions. The massive construction period during the third phase of the Portonaccio structure with the incorporation of Heracles imagery is believed to represent the development of tyrannical power, like that of Thefarie Velianas at Caere, according to Colonna. In fact, the construction of water systems across the region of Veii is believed to be a result of tyrannical power commandeering labour (Colonna 2001: 40-42; Damgaard Andersen 1997). This insistence on 'tyrannical power' neglects the big picture of the development of Veii in other contexts, and is largely based on the assumption that the political developments of Greece and Rome will also be present in Etruria.

C. SITES WITH LITTLE INFORMATION AVAILABLE

1. MAIN POSSIBILITIES

CASTELLINA DEL MARANGONE

The site of Castellina del Marangone is located three kilometres south of Civitavecchia, near the later Roman colony of Castrum Novum (Figure IV.80). The site has the biggest necropolis in the area between Cerveteri and Tarquinia (Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999: 343; the results of the necropolis excavations have not been fully published, see Gran-Aymerich and Prayon (in press)). The presence of ceramics including Euboean, Villanovan and *Bucchero sottile*, discovered during a preliminary excavation, shows continuous occupation of the settlement from the eighth to the sixth centuries BC (Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999: 352; Toti 1967: 55-86).

The funerary evidence has not received much attention. Three tomb areas have been identified in the area, including Volpelle, with seventh to third century tombs, Cava delle Volpelle, with tombs from the sixth to fourth centuries, and Marangone with tombs from the late seventh to late sixth centuries BC. The ceramic material recovered from the areas is only described in a very general way, however (Gianfrotta 1972: 138-140).

Two main areas, A and B, of the settlement were excavated (Figure IV.81, 82). Kilns and iron slag from Area A, dating to the eighth and seventh centuries BC, indicate the presence of craft production. Building activity, however, is not evident until the sixth century BC. In Area A, a small building, a street and a canal were discovered. In Area B, a building that is partly built into the bedrock and consisted of at least two rooms was discovered, the full extent of which was difficult to determine because of an overlying Medieval structure. The excavators interpreted Building III as a possible ante-temple or, more probably, a 'regia', with political and cult functions. Painted revetment plaques associated with the building include painted scenes, one with a broken meander base with a swan above, the other showing a row of rosettes. Building III was destroyed by the end of the fourth or early third century BC (Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999: 352-354).

Other architectural finds, including a statue fragment and a column capital, from next to Building III, and fragments of architectural terracottas found to the south, are believed to be associated with a temple which was probably also located to the south. The statue fragment consists of a female neck and shoulders adorned by a necklace (Figure IV.83). The peperino stone capital, which is too large to have been used in Building III, and is larger than those at Acquarossa, but is coincidentally the size of those from Temple A at Pyrgi, dates to the late sixth or early fifth century BC. Fragments of an Acquarossa -Tuscania type frieze plaque were also found, depicting a soldier stepping into a biga with a driver (Figure IV.84). The plaque dates to 520 BC, and so is contemporary with Building III. The small fragments of the frieze plaque were spread across such a wide area that they are believed to indicate a violent destruction of the structure they adorned. Fragments of other frieze plaques were found; their exact location, however, is uncertain. One fragment shows a large meander motif with a man walking to the left. Another fragment depicts a meander motif of the Lesbos Kyma insignia type. Two fragments depict steers walking to the left (Figure IV.85), similar to those found at Tarquinia (which are walking to the right) and Cerveteri (which are painted, rather than relief plaques) (for Tarquinia, see Cataldi 1993: 210, fig 12; and for Cerveteri, see Melis 1972: 96,97, no 189, tav 28b). Other finds include an impasto fragment with a stamped relief depicting a waterfowl and man riding a horse, dating to 600 BC, as well as a small ivory figurine of a female head with braided hair, dating to the mid-sixth century (Figure IV.86). (Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999: 356-358).

Unfortunately, there are no votives or other settlement evidence to be discussed, and the necropolis data has not been published. It has been debated, however, if there is a connection between Castellina and the nearby sanctuary of Punta della Vipera (described in the next section) (for a discussion see Edlund 1987: 77; Torelli 1980: 109).

PUNTA DELLA VIPERA

The temple at Punta della Vipera is described by Edlund as an extra-urban sanctuary, although a settlement area has not been found, making her interpretation dubious. She also states that the Etruscan Castellina is unconnected to this area (Edlund 1987: 77). Torelli, on the other hand, describes Castellina as an extra-urban sanctuary which is visible from the Punta della Vipera site, making the latter the probable urban area (Torelli 1980: 109).

The sanctuary consisted of a temple with a square cella with a deep pronaos, surrounded by a wall defining the limits of the temenos (Figure IV.87). The structure is dated to 540-520 BC, according to the excavators (Comella 2001: 126; Torelli 1967: 337). At least one type of antefix of a crowned female head, referred to as the Caeretan type, which is thought to date to the early sixth century BC, suggests that the date of the complex may be comparable (Torelli 1967: 337; Edlund 1987: 77). This type of antefix is also associated with the Vigna Marini-Vitalini area at Caere, as well as at Ceri and the Regia at Rome (Andr n 1940: 20, fig 6.13; Ricci Portoghesi 1966: 17, n 2, tav. IV). Most of the architectural terracottas, however, date to the fourth century BC, when the temple was restructured (Torelli 1967: 337-342; Edlund 1987: 77).

The majority of items recovered from the votive deposit of the temple dated to the fourth century; however, a few significant items date to its earliest phase. The discovery of a discoid, lead *sors*, dating to the fifth century, which predates the well-known examples of Viterbo and Arezzo, also points to the oracular practice mentioned by Livy (21.62.5-8) and Plutarch (*Fab.* 2.2) (Figure IV.88). *Sortes* are believed to have been used as oracular tablets, bearing cryptic messages that could be interpreted by specialists to foretell the future (for a discussion, see Torelli and La Regina 1968: 221-227, tav. 68-70). Three ceramic fragments with partial inscriptions to the goddess *Menrva* indicate that the goddess was worshipped here. The oldest fragment is *buccherio* and dates to the last quarter of the sixth century, the other two date to the third century BC. Interestingly, a connection between the veneration of *Menrva* and oracular practices is also attested at the Portonaccio temple at Veii (see

IV.ii, Veii section)(Colonna 1985: 107). Also found within the temenos was an inscribed, laminated lead tablet fragment, believed to be related to sacred activities, dated to the last quarter of the sixth century (Comella 2001: 132, no 1, tav 37; Torelli 1967: 347-352).

POGGIO BUCO

The site of Poggio Buco, west of Pitigliano, shows signs of occupation from the Final Bronze Age to the Republican period (Figure IV.89) (Bartoloni 1992: 9). The remains of a large, rectangular building consisting of tufo blocks have been uncovered, and are believed to be those of a palace or temple. Pozzi from the same area contained fragments of architectural terracottas, votives and *bucchero* pottery (Bartoloni 1992: 11). The architectural terracottas included four frieze plaques scenes. Two types with warriors going to both the left and right (Figure IV.90), similar to those from Piazza d'Armi, Tuscania and the Lapis Niger at Rome, date to the first half of the sixth century. The other simas, slightly smaller than the plaques, include one with sphinges and stags (Figure IV.91), another with men riding horses to the left (Figure IV.92), as well as an unidentified, highly fragmented scene, including a male shoulder and female feet, which might possibly be a scene related to Peleus, Thetis and the Nereids, according to Bartoloni, although this is unclear. The excavator, Bartoloni, states that the building demonstrates both public and private functions, including ritual and habitation purposes. The decorations, however, she goes on to say, are indicative of aristocratic display (Bartoloni 1992: 26, 27; Andr n 1940: pl 25).

The cult activities continued into the Republican period (Bartoloni 1992: 14). Unfortunately, more of the specifics concerning the form of the building or the objects found within have not been published yet. The potential, however, is there for another monumental complex to be located in southern Etruria during the Archaic period, with architectural decorations shared by other nearby sites.

TUSCANIA

The site of Tuscania, positioned between Acquarossa and Tarquinia, existed from the seventh to the second century BC, with its height in the fourth century BC. Archaic frieze plaques have been discovered in the Ara del Tufo necropolis, and are believed to relate to a small chapel or ritual, probably wooden, structure which has not survived (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 163). This structure is not yet understood; it is referred to as the 'Tumulus' or 'Structure 5' due to the confusion over its function(s). The remains of tufa blocks in a curvilinear form, revealed a concentration of architectural terracottas (Figure IV.93). The excavators believe that the architectural terracottas belonged to Structure 5, and that it could have functioned as a cult space within the necropolis. The architectural terracottas show a connection with those found at Acquarossa (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 163-166, 176-177).

Six types of frieze plaque scenes have been found at the site, including all four of the Acquarossa types, with an additional two types of frieze plaque scenes that are very similar to other Acquarossa types. Both the banqueting and dancing scene frieze plaques, referred to as Acquarossa types C and D, have been found at Ara del Tufo (Figure IV.94) (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 166, fig 11-16). In addition, there are also two fragments of both the Aquarossa type A and B scenes, depicting Heracles wrestling the Cretan Bull and the Nemean Lion (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 167,168, fig 17-18).

The other frieze plaques which are otherwise similar to those from Acquarossa bear some interesting differences (the variations of which are still slightly debated and updated as more fragments are found; for a discussion see Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 193-200). These relate to the pair of departure, or procession scenes, going to the left or to the right, which are similar to Acquarossa types A and B. The procession scenes from both sites include armed footsoldiers walking in groups of two or three while another soldier steps onto a *biga*. The Tuscania plaques, however, do not include some of the main elements of the Acquarossa plaques, such as the scenes of Heracles wrestling the Cretan Bull (Acquarossa type A) or the Nemean Lion

(Acquarossa type B), as well as winged horses (also in type A). The procession scene going to the left, referred to as Tuscania D, departure I, however, includes a third foot soldier figure holding a *lituus* (Figures IV.95) (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 172-174, fig. 38-39). Tuscania D variant 1 shows the soldier holding a shield and one spear in addition to the *lituus*, while variant 2 shows the soldier holding an additional spear. The procession going to the right, referred to as Tuscania C, departure II, does not include a soldier carrying a *lituus*, but does include slight differences in the figure of the unarmed man farthest to the right (Figure IV.96). In the Tuscania versions, this figure leads the procession wearing a knee-length tunic and carrying a long staff shaped like a *lituus*, whereas in the Acquarossa plaques, the figure faces the approaching procession wearing a long tunic and carrying a long two-pronged staff (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 169-171, fig. 34-37).

In addition, there are simas that are unique to Tuscania, such as the cavalry striding procession scene (Figure IV.97) (Tuscania type A variants I and II, Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 169, fig. 24, 26) and the cavalry galloping procession scene (Figure IV.98) (Tuscania type B variants I and II, Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 169, fig. 27-33).

The Tuscania architectural terracottas have been dated to 530-500 BC. Interestingly, the frieze plaque scenes of processions going to the right and the simas with horseriding scenes going to the left are stylistically and thematically similar to the Caeretan plaques, possibly from the Vigna Marini-Vitalini area, which are believed to date to the first half of the sixth century, making the structure possibly slightly older (see Andr  n 1940: pl. 4, 5 for the Caeretan plaques).

The Ara del Tufo structure is different from the rest of the structures considered here, due to the location of this structure within a necropolis, and its probable small size. The architectural terracottas, however, link it directly with the monumental complex at Acquarossa. Ara del Tufo is believed to have served both ritual and political functions. Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi state that Ara del Tufo is directly related to the three nearby monumental tombs, and that the frieze plaque iconography expressed funerary and political messages. Other examples of funerary cult structures exist,

including Grotta Porcina-Vetralla near Blera and Sasso Pizzuto outside Tuscania (although without frieze plaques), illustrating the formalisation and monumentalisation of funerary ritual during this period (Edlund 1987: 71,72; Prayon 1993: 17; Quilici Gigli 1976: 237-240). Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi have concluded that this form of architecture is an extension of the monumental complexes, bringing urbanisation into the necropoleis, which allowed for another sphere of social life to combine both ritual and political activities (Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993: 176-181; Wikander, Strandberg Olofsson and Moretti Sgubini 1986: 106).

The structure acted as a visible and powerful forum for funerary cult and the continuation of ideology orchestrated by elites associated (either directly or indirectly) with Structure 5, and quite probably the power structure at work within the Tuscania area, as well as Acquarossa. Unfortunately, the settlement associated with this period has not been excavated. It is not known whether the site contained a monumental complex or some other structure with analogous architectural terracottas. Fragments of Tuscania plaques have apparently also been found at Acquarossa (Strandberg Olofsson 1993: 194-195). It is still believed that the Acquarossa-type frieze plaques were produced in Acquarossa, so the distribution of them to the nearby site of Tuscania seems a likely pairing; it is unclear, however, how this relationship related to the political and ritual nature of the two sites.

2. OTHER POSSIBLE SITES

There are many other potential ritual structures, which seem to date to the sixth century BC; however, there are not enough data to discuss them fully in relation to the others presented here.

ORVIETO

In the case of Orvieto, two ritual structures may have existed. The 'Cannicella sanctuary' situated in the necropolis of the same name is not well understood (Figure IV.99). What remains is a series of basins, one of which is fed by an underwater conduit, next to a round altar. Architectural terracottas and a marble statue of a nude female from the sixth century (Figures IV.100, 101) (Andrén 1967: 50,51, pl XVI-XXII) were found in the area, although the form of the structure is unclear for this period. Votive material, architectural terracottas and a Tuscan column capital indicate that the area, and potential structure, were used from the middle of the sixth century to the first century BC; however, most of the architectural material represents a fifth to fourth century BC phase. A layer of ash across the area suggests that its end was the result of fire damage. An inscription on a bronze tablet to the goddess *VEI*, dated possibly to the fifth century BC, has resulted in the sanctuary being associated with this fertility goddess (Andrén 1967: 74, no 66). Edlund interprets this as an extra-mural or extra-urban road sanctuary with a funerary connection. Prayon also makes a definite connection between the ritual structure and the necropolis. (Edlund 1987: 70; Colonna 1985a: 116-118; Prayon 1993: 28-29).

The other possible ritual structure near Orvieto is located at Campo della Fiera. Architectural terracotta fragments and the remains of a 'complex' consisting of walls of tufa blocks (still standing to a height of 1.50 m) have been discovered. It is believed to have been destroyed by fire. (Edlund 1987: 78, 80; Andrén 1940: 190, 239-243, pl 72). Edlund identifies this an extra-urban sanctuary, but admits that the lack of evidence makes it impossible to verify its function and form (Edlund 1987: 80).

a) REMAINS OF ARCHITECTURAL TERRACOTTAS

Remains of architectural terracottas, which are believed to indicate the presence of ritual structures, were found at Chiusi and Vulci. These two sites have not been considered more deeply for this project because of the lack of structural remains. The presence of architectural terracottas is not presumed automatically to indicate the presence of a ritual structure for my purposes (see Chapter III, the 'Limitations' and 'Methodology' sections). It is interesting, however, that some of the material found is similar to examples from other sites.

CHIUSI

At Chiusi, two pieces of Archaic architectural terracottas were found. One antefix of a Silen head or possibly Achelous (Figure IV.102) (Andrén 1940:252-254, pl. 86.303) is identical to examples found at Tarquinia and Populonia (Andrén 1940: pl. 23.80 and 85.298.1 respectively). There was also an antefix of a female head (Figure IV.103) (Andrén 1940: 86.302).

VULCI

Five pieces of Archaic architectural terracottas were found at Vulci. These included antefixes in the form of heads of a small female, Achelous, a silen and a maenad, as well as a mould for a female head antefix (Andrén 1940: 214-216, pl 79.271, 79.272). The antefixes of the Silen head and Achelous are similar to those found at the Portonaccio Temple at Veii and Temple B at Pyrgi (Figure IV.104) (see Andrén 1940: pl 2.3).

b) SPRING SANCTUARIES

There are also two noteworthy sites, which have not been considered here because of their form and location, as well as poor preservation. Arezzo and Marzabotto both have ritual architecture from the sixth century BC; however, both sites are distant from the rest of Etruria proper, which is under consideration here. Also, Fonte Veneziana at Arezzo and the spring sanctuary at Marzabotto represent very different forms of worship, focussed around the presence of water, which related to other

circumstances. Both are interpreted as extra-mural spring sanctuaries by Edlund (Edlund 1987: 68).

AREZZO

The original fountain of Fonte Veneziana at Arezzo no longer exists; however, the remains of large walls and a votive deposit have been found by a modern spring (Lazzeri 1927: 117). The votive deposit contained approximately two hundred bronze statuettes, as well as anatomical votives, rings, vases and *aes rude*, some of which date to the sixth century (Figure IV.105) (Lazzeri 1927: 114-115; Colonna 1985a: 172). The excavator, Bocci Pacini, interpreted the area as a water cult site (Bocci Pacini 1980: 89-91), but there is very little to work with in this case.

MARZABOTTO

The spring sanctuary at Marzabotto can be firmly identified. It consists of a square well and well head, and the remains of two retaining walls (Figure IV.106). Fragments of a ridgepole tile and akroterion indicate that at least part of the structure was roofed (Gualandi 1970: 219, fig 1; Colonna 1985b: 113- 114). Local pottery and votive bronze statuettes, dating to the late sixth or early fifth century BC, were also found (Figure IV.107) (Gualandi 1974: 63-68). The fountain suggests that healing or purification rituals may have taken place here (Edlund 1987: 69). Again there is very little to work with in this case.

3. LATIUM VETUS

Two other significant examples of ritual architecture have been, for the most part, omitted from this study because of their locations outside of Etruria. In the interest of limiting the dataset in a finite way, structures dating to the fifth century, and which are not strictly within Etruria, have been left out, although many settlements had very strong links with Etruscan settlements. The two briefly described below have been included here because they share frieze plaques from the VRV series that have been found at Veii and Tarquinia.

ROME

The Regia in the Forum of Rome has been extensively excavated over a long period of time, but unfortunately never fully published. The site of the Regia has several building phases, beginning in the late seventh century BC (Figures IV.108, 109). The excavator, Brown, originally suggested that it was a ritual complex that was continually restructured. The complex was destroyed by fire at the end of the sixth century BC, and then rebuilt for the fifth time in c. 500 BC, when it became the Republican Regia, the residence for the new position of *rex sacrorum*. The meaning behind the transformation of building form is difficult to discuss, because Brown slightly changed his interpretations, later suggesting that the early phases were part of a gradual progression towards the fifth phase, with all of them containing two rooms connected by a vestibule, at the back of a trapezoidal shaped portico. According to Brown, the structure was never a residence, but shrines to Mars and Ops Consiva, and later the office of the *pontifex maximus* in the late Republic (Brown 1974-5: 15-36; Brown 1976: 11; Scheffer 1990: 186; Cornell 1995: 239-240).

The architectural terracottas from the third and fourth phases are well attested. For the third phase, there were two frieze plaque scenes, both of which included felines; one, however, depicts a minotaur between felines (Figure IV.110). Female head antefixes similar to those from Acquarossa and Caere were also found. In addition, there was a fragment of a foot from a life-size statue. The majority of the architectural terracottas is believed to have been made locally in Rome. In contrast, the architectural terracottas from the fourth phase are believed to have been made outside

Rome. Female head antefixes like those from Vigna Parocchiale at Caere have been found. Fragments of simas and antefixes found in association with the Regia belong to types which have been found at other ritual structures which bore VRV frieze plaques, although no VRV plaques have been found at the Regia itself. The decorations of this phase suggest that the Regia was part of a network exchanging architectural terracottas, the production centre(s) of which have yet to be determined. (Downey 1993: 233-247).

Fragments of the VRV frieze plaques have been found elsewhere in Rome, however. In the Esquiline area, the right procession scene has been found. In the Palatine area, the right and left processions, chariot race, horseriding and banqueting scenes have been found. In the Capitoline area, the chariot race and horseriding scenes have been found. At Sant' Omobono, the right and left procession scenes have been found. (Gantz 1975: 2-4).

It is noteworthy that the Regia was destroyed, perhaps unintentionally, and restructured at same time as many other ritual structures in Etruria. This may indicate that some of the same processes were occurring in Rome.

VELLETRI

The site of Velletri was a Latin colony, predominately Volscian, forty kilometres south of Rome on the slopes of the Alban Hills (Smith 1996: 137; Cornell 1995: 303). It was incorporated into the Roman state after the Romans defeated and expelled the rebelling Volscian population, making the inhabitants Roman citizens in 494 BC (Gantz 1975: 1; Livy 2.31.4). Gantz argues that this date is perfect for the timing of the construction of the temple, which would have called for using architectural decorations from the same terracotta workshop employed for the Capitoline Temple in Rome, namely the Veientine workshop of Vulca (Gantz 1975: 8). The date of the temple construction at Velletri is now believed to predate this period, and the reasons behind the use of the VRV frieze plaques are likely to be more complex than ordering architectural terracottas from a workshop because it was responsible for an important temple in Rome. As Gantz states himself, the VRV frieze plaques were used at a few

locations at Rome (see above). Their use at Velletri may have represented connections with some or all of these temples, as well as the Portonaccio temple at Veii.

The temple at Velletri, at the site of the current church of the SS. Stimate, was probably constructed in approximately 530 BC with a Vitruvian Tuscan style form (Figure IV.111) (Fortunati 1990: 201). All six of the VRV frieze plaques were found here (Figure IV.112). There is also believed to have been a votive deposit, dating as early as the last quarter of the sixth century. Two notable votives are a bronze female statuette from the earliest phase of the deposit, and a ceramic model of a temple from the fifth century BC (Fortunati 1990: 205, 206, no 27, 28). The temple is thought to have survived for several centuries, and gradually went out of use (Fortunati 1990: 200-206; Fortunati 1993: 255-256).

The connections between the Velletri temple and the Portonaccio temple at Veii are remarkable. Only these two temples are associated with all six VRV frieze plaque scenes. The second phase, or *oikos* phase, of the Portonaccio temple, lasting from 540/530 to 510/500 BC, contained the six VRV frieze plaque scenes. When it was completely restructured to its more lasting Vitruvian Tuscan style, the VRV plaques were discarded. The Velletri temple was also constructed and decorated with all six VRV frieze plaque scenes in approximately 530 BC, but already in the Vitruvian Tuscan style, and was not restructured or redecorated. The frieze plaque scenes and their themes must have been deemed more acceptable for longer in Velletri than Veii for some reason. Both represent the new form of ritual architecture at the end of the sixth century BC, with three *cellae*, even if their architectural decorations differ by the very end of the sixth century BC. Their structural form and the integration of votive deposits at both may directly relate to changes in ritual practices, and subsequently to their endurance as ritual structures.

V. ICONOGRAPHY RELATED TO THE RITUAL STRUCTURES

Chapters V and VI relate closely to each other. This chapter focuses on the transformations in ritual space, from the monumentalisation of ritual structures, during the late seventh and early sixth centuries BC, to a period of destruction and restructuring at the end of the sixth to the early fifth centuries BC. Special attention will be given to the architectural decorations from these structures, in relation to their iconographic significance for the developing social hierarchy, as well as their involvement in exchange networks across central Italy. Chapter VI takes many of these issues into other contexts, in part by discussing how the iconography integral to the ritual structures relates directly to the iconography involved in other social activities, and how together an iconography of authority for the Etruscans was constructed. More broadly it investigates the relationship between materiality and iconography.

A. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RITUAL STRUCTURES

The development of the sacred sphere and ritual activities was a gradual process across central Italy, and doubtless goes back centuries before it is clearly visible in the archaeological record. In the early seventh century, however, areas of sacred importance within the landscape became monumentalised with structures in order to demonstrate them formally and visually. This occurred across Etruria, north and south, as well as inland and coastal, with the first examples at Murlo and Veii (Comunità and Portonaccio). In fact, at least seven ritual structures were constructed in the seventh century BC, including Acquarossa, Castelnuovo Berardenga, Tarquinia- Civita Complex and Veii- Campetti, as well as the three previously mentioned). Another nine ritual structures were built in the first half of the sixth century BC (Caere- Vigna Parrocchiale; Tarquinia- Central Structure, Ara della Regina and Gravisca; Veii- Piazza d'Armi; Castellina del Marangone; Punta della Vipera; Poggio Buco; and Tuscania- Ara del Tufo), and an additional four structures in the second half of the sixth century BC (Caere- Sant' Antonio, Valle della Mola and Montetosto; and Tarquinia- Santuario).

This dramatic change in form of ritual areas, as well as expenditure of energy, shows the growth of importance of ritual for the Etruscans during this period. The twenty ritual structures under study here were all constructed within 150 years, showing a relatively quick adoption of the idea that these structures were a necessary part of a settlement. This comes at an early stage of development of the settlements, in many cases, when disparate clusters of settlement areas were spread across a plateau, possibly demarcating separate familial groups. The construction of monumental ritual structures built with foundations of tufa blocks took precedence over non-ritual habitation structures, mostly built of ephemeral materials. The ritual sphere may have even taken precedence over the funerary sphere at some of the sites, where Orientalising tumuli had not yet been constructed, and in some cases, have not been found at all, such as Acquarossa and Murlo. Caere, on the other hand, had rich, grand tumuli for a century before its first monumental ritual structure, Vigna Parrocchiale, was constructed in the early sixth century BC.

The construction of durable façades to house, protect, demarcate and aggrandise a place of ritual, reflects a change in attitude toward ritual practices and divinities (or the supernatural in general). The organisation of labour indicates that a social hierarchy was involved in its completion. The presumed need for a monumental structure suggests that a group of individuals had a long-term connection with the ritual area.

Interestingly, the sites in question show two different types of progression. At some of the sites, such as Acquarossa, Castelnuovo Berardenga, Murlo, Castellina del Marangone and Poggio Buco (Punta della Vipera is debatable), there is evidence of only one ritual structure. At Caere, Tarquinia and Veii, however, there were multiple ritual structures co-existing. This might relate for the most part to the sizes of the sites or populations involved. It does, however, seem significant that the sites containing only one ritual structure were also the first four to be destroyed by the end of the sixth century BC (Acquarossa, Castelnuovo Berardenga, Murlo, Castellina del Marangone). The first three of these were abandoned completely, unlike the other settlements. The multiple ritual structures at Caere, Tarquinia and Veii may indicate

that a decentralised character persisted at the sites, with only a loose organisation tying separate groups together. Interestingly, a decentralised organisation seems to have proved better for long-term survival than a centralised organisation.

B. THE FORM OF THE RITUAL STRUCTURES

1. CONSTRUCTION

Ironically, the best preserved ritual structures are those that were destroyed, and the settlements abandoned. Most of the other ritual structure areas were rebuilt upon several times, making the Orientalising and Archaic phases difficult to assess.

Seven of the structures could be termed 'monumental complexes': Murlo, Tarquinia-Civita Complex and Central Structure, Acquarossa, Castelnuovo Berardenga, Caere-Vigna Parrocchiale and Montetosto. They are very variable in size, but all are relatively large. All of them, with the exception of the Civita Complex, are square in shape and consist of wings of rooms around a porticoed courtyard, although the extent of the structure at Acquarossa is debated and it may have lacked a fourth wing. A common feature amongst many of them is restricted access. The structures at Murlo, Tarquinia's Central Structure, Caere's Vigna Parrocchiale and Montetosto all seem to have only had one main route of access. The Civita Complex at Tarquinia is rather different, with a street running through its two halves for much of its existence. Most importantly, the monumental complexes combined multiple functions. There is evidence of craft production, banqueting and ritual activities at many of the structures. In addition, the iconography inherent in the architectural decorations (which will be discussed in more detail in the next section) indicates that the structures formed the core of an elite lifestyle. By combining large structures of imposing size and with a limited degree of access, which required large amounts of labour, with activities associated with elites, such as banqueting and the overseeing of craft production, these buildings indicate that very real and visible social divisions existed during this period at these sites. What is perhaps more surprising and significant is the associated separation or seclusion of ritual activities from the non-elite members of society.

The terms 'palace' and 'regia', which are often used, may, however, not be the most appropriate for these structures. 'Palace' tends to denote a familial line in control of the structure and the surrounding settlement. 'Regia' suggests specific types of leadership and authority of a kingly nature, which is actually too specific, and cannot be verified by the evidence. Many of these sites seem to be too complicated to be explained away in one word. Because many of the sites contained more than one monumental complex, as well as ritual structures of other sorts in some cases, the amount of control held by the individuals associated with the structures may have been limited spatially and in regard to certain activities.

Many of the other buildings are relatively small in comparison to the monumental complexes, and illustrate the diversity of ritual structures during the sixth century. The earliest phase of the ritual structure at Gravisca, for instance, is small and not of a typical form. It consisted of two rectangular rooms opening onto a courtyard with an altar (Torelli 1971: 235-240, fig 41).

Veii, for instance, shows an interesting development of forms. Campetti is referred to as a Vitruvian or Tuscan style temple because of its size; however, the internal structure is unknown and the possibility of other functions is unclear (Pallottino 1938-1939: 402). The second phase of Portonaccio, during the second half of the sixth century, was a small *oikos* style structure, which was replaced at the end of the sixth century with a Tuscan-style temple with a pool. Piazza d'Armi was also an *oikos* style structure, which was gradually augmented, including the addition of a cistern.

The forms of other ritual structures during this period are unclear. The destruction and/or reconstruction of areas, such as at Castellina, Punta della Vipera, Ara della Regina, Poggio Buco, Santuario make it impossible to describe clearly the Archaic structures. It does seem apparent, however, that the earlier structures were of very different forms to their successors, suggesting that the prior forms were deemed to be no longer appropriate. The form of the Ara del Tufo structure at Tuscania is also unclear; however, its position within a necropolis makes it something of an exception in relation to the other structures in question.

2. DESTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION

The end of the use of ritual structures is just as telling about their social context as is their construction. Chart V.1 (volume II), depicts the chronology of the ritual structures described in Chapter IV. This has been included to serve as a visual aid to reconsider the developments in the ritual sphere on a regional scale. It is difficult to express the intricacies expressed in the previous chapter, such as difficulties in pinpointing precise dates, but this at least gives a view of the major changes. Multiple building phases of the ritual structures are illustrated with bars containing different patterns. An 'X' symbol has been used to delineate final destruction periods, in deference to ritual structures that went out of use gradually. Nine of the structures were destroyed (excluding Pyrgi, due to the later date of its construction and destruction); Castelnuovo Berardenga was destroyed in the first half of the sixth century BC; three were destroyed in the second half of the sixth century BC (Acquarossa, Murlo and Castellina del Marangone); five were destroyed in the first half of the fifth century (Caere- Vigna Parrocchiale, Tarquinia- Central Structure, Santuario, Veii- Campetti and Comunità). Two of the destroyed monumental complexes, Caere-Vigna Parrocchiale and Tarquinia- Central Structure, had temples built on top of the earlier remains. Both Murlo and Acquarossa also had earlier destruction phases, which may have been accidental, suggested by the immediate rebuilding of the same forms of the structures (Phillips 1993; *Architettura* 1986).

Many of the structures were altered dramatically in form and decoration. The Valle della Mola site at Caere and the Portonaccio site at Veii were completely reconstructed in the middle of the sixth century and at the end of the sixth century BC, respectively. The earlier sixth century structure at Valle della Mola, unfortunately, is unclear. It was replaced, however by a rectangular Greek-style temple, probably at the end of the sixth or early fifth century BC. The Portonaccio site went through three main phases. The second phase, which began in the middle of the sixth century BC, consisted of an *oikos* structure, or *regia* (see Chapter III for a discussion of these terms), decorated with all six scenes of the VRV frieze plaques. This was destroyed and replaced with a Tuscan temple with an adjacent pool, and decorated with architectural decorations similar to Temple B at Pyrgi and Montetosto, at the end of the sixth century BC. Remnants of the previous architectural decorations were placed

in the pool. Neither Valle della Mola nor Portonaccio experienced a destructive phase with a break in construction phases, however, and the changes in architectural style seem to reflect voluntary choices.

Piazza d'Armi, Punta della Vipera, Ara della Regina and Sant' Antonio were also restructured. Between the end of the seventh and middle of the sixth century BC, Piazza d'Armi became an *oikos* temple, with a rectangular form, but was augmented architecturally, including the creation of a piazza area in front of the structure with a cistern, as well as a street running perpendicularly during the middle of the sixth to early fifth century BC. The structure itself was redecorated twice during this period (Bartoloni 2001b: 29-31, Ward-Perkins 1961: 32). The Archaic structure at Punta della Vipera, from 540-520 BC, consisted of a square cella with a deep *pronaos*; the area surrounding it was restructured in the fourth century to include temenos walls and eventually became a Roman villa (Edlund 1987: 77; Torelli 1967: 333). The Archaic structure of Ara della Regina is unclear; the construction layer is identified by blocks, architectural terracottas and an altar. The predominant phase dates to the fourth century BC, which is a Tuscan form of sorts, with a *pronaos* containing four ionic columns. Interestingly, the orientation of the structure changed during this latter phase from northwest-southeast to east-west (Romanelli 1948: 238-268; Colonna 1985a: 71-73, Edlund 1987: 67). At Sant' Antonio, the Orientalising stone structure was replaced with two parallel, rectangular Tuscan-type temples, and the area in front of the temples was levelled to create a piazza at the end of the sixth or early fifth century BC (Izzet 2000: 141-142).

Montetosto was redecorated with new architectural details in the early fifth century BC, and additional ones a half century later. Both the initial phase and the later additions during the second phase had decorations similar to Pyrgi. A horseriding scene frieze plaque like those found at Murlo and Acquarossa was present in the first phase. A road was constructed, separating the structure from the tomb during the first half of the sixth century. The Montetosto structure continued to be used until the second or first century BC (Colonna 1985b: 194).

The Civita Complex at Tarquinia and Piazza d'Armi at Veii went out of use during the fifth century BC. Others, including Caere's Sant' Antonio and Valle della Mola, Tarquinia's Gravisca, Poggio Buco and Tuscania's Ara del Tufo, gradually went out of use after several centuries.

3. VOTIVE DEPOSITS

The deposition of votive offerings is the only archaeologically visible ritual practice for this time period and region. Throughout much of the ancient Mediterranean, votive offerings characterised the relationship between the worshipper and the worshipped, with the former trying to gain favour through the presentation of gifts. The offerings came in the form of animal sacrifices or libations, carried out at an altar, or of manufactured goods, such as pottery and bronze sculpture. The goods may have been displayed within the ritual structure for some time, and eventually put into pits or treasuries (Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 224).

The practice of depositing votives was transformed during the sixth century BC. Votive deposits from this period can be divided into three categories: active deposits where offerings were made in association with a ritual structure; foundation deposits where offerings were made continually in direct association with the construction, or sometimes reconstruction, of a ritual structure; and terminal deposits where offerings were made on the site of a disused or destroyed ritual structure, usually utilising architectural decorations from the structure (see Table V.1 in this volume).

Active deposits are slightly difficult to identify, because it is sometimes unclear if the architectural terracottas were added to an already current votive deposit, rather than resulting from a reconstruction of the structure. Four of the ritual structures clearly had active votive deposits: Portonaccio, Punta della Vipera, Gravisca and Sant' Antonio. Portonaccio seems to be the oldest, with a *bucchero* cup inscribed to the goddess *Menrva*, dating to the first half of the sixth century BC (Giglioli 1930: 321; Colonna 1985a: 107). The votive deposit at Punta della Vipera contained objects primarily from the fourth century BC; however, a *bucchero* fragment inscribed with a dedication to *Menrva* dates to the last quarter of the sixth century BC (Comella 2001: 133, no 3, tav. XXXIX, [*men*]ervas). Gravisca contained a wealth of offerings, the

majority of which were Greek vases, the provenance of which has been used to define which areas of Greece were participating at the sanctuary, as well as attesting to its earliest form as a Greek establishment (Colonna 1985a: 142; Edlund 1987: 76; Torelli 1971). Votive offerings seem to have been made at Sant' Antonio, as is shown by the bronze clubs and inscribed weight found in association with the temples, although they were not found in a defined votive deposit (Izzet 1999-2000: 141-142). It is significant that two of the earliest known votive objects bear inscriptions to the goddess *Menrva*. It is not fully clear, however, how the devotion of *Menrva* relates to the development of votive offerings for the Etruscans.

Four of the structures had foundation deposits: the Civita Complex and Central Structure at Tarquinia, as well as Sant' Antonio and Poggio Buco. Both the Civita Complex and Central Structure at Tarquinia contained votive deposits under foundation walls of the structures, which were then sealed with the structure itself. Sant' Antonio at Caere and Poggio Buco are slightly different from the others, and will be discussed below. The Civita Complex and Sant' Antonio also share a funerary connection; both sites contain ninth century BC burials, which may be directly connected with their development into formal ritual areas.

Another four of the structures were destroyed and replaced with terminal deposits: Campetti, Murlo, Santuario and Basamento Semicircolare; all of them, however, are slightly different from each other. The architectural decorations and other elements of the Campetti structure were strewn across the remains of the structure, which remained a place of votive worship for centuries. At Murlo, the structure was destroyed and the architectural decorations dismantled. Many of the frieze plaques and statues were broken in two and buried in ditches at two different points at the site; the whole area was then covered in soil (Phillips 1993: 48). The reasons behind the end of the Santuario at Tarquinia are unknown, whether deliberate or accidental; however, a very deliberate votive deposit was created from the ruins of architectural details and other items placed into the massive Basamento Semicircolare, which continued to be used as a votive deposit into Hellenistic times (Romanelli 1948: 214-218).

Sant' Antonio at Caere and Poggio Buco, on the other hand, can be clarified as a mixture of foundation and terminal votive deposits, because of the nearby pits into which remains of architectural details and pottery were deposited during reconstruction periods. Both had votive deposits that were created from material from the structure at the end of its existence; the deposits also paved the way for the next phase of construction. Ara della Regina started its votive deposit in the fourth century BC, which lasted until the first century BC (Colonna 1985a: 78).

The different types of votive deposits represent different ritual activities and attitudes towards ritual space. Foundation deposits may represent the acknowledgment that an area is already considered sacred, or special in some way, and that care must be taken before building a structure on top of it. It has also been suggested that burials in these areas may relate to the legitimisation of belonging, or ownership of some nature, for individuals or a group to the area (see Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 49, 159, 171). The deposition of architectural decorations and votives during redecoration or reconstruction phases seems to indicate a level of respect for ritual structures and the elements they are composed of, particularly with figurative imagery including frieze plaques, antefixes and statues. This is also very similar to the concerns behind many of the terminal deposits. At Campetti and the Basamento Semicircolare, for instance, the transformation of the ritual structure into ruins covered with votives shows an acknowledgment of the importance of the site, as well as reverence for it. These two sites became votive deposits through their destruction. Murlo is a different case. Because of its deliberate destruction and dismantling, the deposition of architectural decorations and details may partly show a level of respect towards items once associated with the sacred; however, breaking them first indicates that they were either no longer effective or it was part of an attempt to make them no longer effective, also which is indicated by the abandonment of the area.

The vast majority of ritual structures does not seem to have had active votive deposits during the period under study. Eight of the structures seem to have never had any type of votive deposit, including: Acquarossa, Castelnuovo Berardenga, Castellina del Marangone, Montetosto, Vigna Parrocchiale, Valle della Mola, Ara del Tufo and Veii's Comunità. The absence of foundation deposits may indicate that these

structures were not built on land with strong prior associations of sacredness.¹ The lack of active votive deposits could indicate many things at work, including different types of ritual activities that simply did not include votive deposits (or possibly centred around gift-giving unrelated to deposition), or limited access to worship or divinities. The absence of terminal deposits suggests a limited effectiveness of these structures, or areas, to hold a connection with the sacred. It should be remembered, however, that it is possible that the remains of some votive deposits are now untraceable in the archaeological record, or have not yet been found.

¹ Many of the earliest ritual sites in central Italy began as votive deposits in natural, non-monumentalised areas (Edlund: 1987: 44).

Table V.1. The Use of Votive Deposits at the Ritual Structures

Destroyed Ritual Structures	Approximate Dates of Destruction	Type of Votive Deposit
Castelnuovo Berardenga	575	-
Murlo-Poggio Civitate	550/530	T
Acquarossa- Zone F	525	-
Castellina del Marangone	500	-
Tarquinia- Central Structure	500 (site used again in later 3 rd c)	F
Caere-Vigna Parocchiale	500/490 (later temple 450)	-
Tarquinia- Santuario	450	T
Veii- Comunità	450	-
Veii- Campetti	450	-

Ritual Structures not Destroyed	Approximate Dates of when Out of Use	Type of Votive Deposit
<u>Restructured</u>		
Caere-Valle della Mola	500	-
Veii- Piazza d'Armi	425 ?	A (at least in Hellenistic period)
Punta della Vipera	4th c	A
Veii- Portonaccio	396 (traditionally), later	A
Tarquinia- Ara della Regina	3rd c	A
Caere-Sant'Antonio	300	F, T
<u>Funerary Connection</u>		
Tuscania-Ara del Tufo	5 th c or later	-
Caere- Montetosto*	150	-
<u>Outside of urban area</u>		
Tarquinia- Gravisca	3rd c	A
also Caere- Montetosto*	150	-
<u>Out of use</u>		
Tarquinia- Civita Complex	450	F
<u>End date unclear</u>		
Poggio Buco	4 th /3 rd c	A

F= Foundation Deposit A=Active Deposit T=Terminal Deposit

C. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FRIEZE PLAQUES

The most prevalent feature connecting the majority of ritual structures from this period is their architectural decorations, including antefixes and frieze plaques. The figured frieze plaques are the most significant for investigating the functions of the ritual structures and the individuals associated with the structures. The depictions of people involved in specific activities used to adorn several similar structures must relate directly to the uses of the structures. Low-relief frieze plaques conveying particular themes and activities (discussed more fully below) existed in Etruria on fourteen of the twenty structures under study in this project, which are all deemed ritual structures, and only from the early seventh to the end of the sixth century BC (see Table V.2 and Figure V.1). Their use ended with the destruction or reconstruction of the structures.

Table V.2. Distribution of the Frieze Plaques by Site

Acquarossa	(all from the Acquarossa-Tuscania series): Procession L Procession R Banquet Dancing
Murlo	Procession L Banquet Assembly Horse Race R
Caere- Vigna Parocchiale	<u>Figured frieze plaques:</u> Three horses walking R Procession R Soldiers on horseback L <u>Painted plaques:</u> Soldiers on horseback L Centaur Hunting Dogs R Bulls R Warriors Warriors galloping L Two horses galloping L
Tarquiniā- Civita Complex	Procession L of Acquarossa-Tuscania series Banquet VRV series

Tarquinia- Santuario	Procession of VRV series (it is not clear which procession)
Tarquinia- Central Structure	Procession L of VRV series Banquet of VRV series Steers walking R Warrior walking R- small fragment
Tarquinia- Ara della Regina	Procession L of VRV series Procession R of VRV series Banquet of VRV series Battle Procession- fragments of unknown scene
Veii- Piazza d'Armi	Procession R- similar to Tuscania Procession scenes (not photographed) Bartoloni 2001: 29. Warriors on horseback L Panther and other felines
Veii- Campetti	Procession L of VRV series Procession scene (like those from Piazza d'Armi) Warriors galloping L of VRV series (three pairs of soldiers on horseback with weapons) Chariot racing R of VRV series
Veii- Comunità	Procession R- similar to VRV series
Veii- Portonaccio	Procession L of VRV series Procession R of VRV series Banquet of VRV series Warriors galloping L of VRV series Chariot racing of VRV series Assembly of VRV series
Castellina del Marangone	Procession L of Acquarossa-Tuscania series
Poggio Buco	Procession R Unknown scene with male shoulder and female feet
Tuscania- Ara del Tufo	Procession L of Aquarossa-Tuscania series Procession R of Aquarossa- Tuscania series Banquet of Aquarossa- Tuscania series Dancing of Aquarossa- Tuscania series Procession L variation of Aquarossa-Tuscania series Procession R variation of Aquarossa-Tuscania series Cavalry procession L (sima) Cavalry procession R (sima)

1. DISTRIBUTION OF THE FRIEZE PLAQUES

Even more interesting is that eleven of the twenty ritual structures shared exact copies of figured frieze plaques (see Figure V.1 for a distribution map). Two main groups or series of figured frieze plaques have emerged at a number of sites (see Chiaramonte Treré 1999: 16-17). Fragments of the Veii-Rome-Velletri plaques have been found at seven of the ritual structures. Fragments of the Acquarossa-Tuscania plaques have been found at four of the ritual structures.

The distribution of the VRV plaques is as follows (see Table V.3):

Three of the main ritual structures at Veii had some of the VRV plaques. Campetti had the Left Procession, the Soldiers on Horseback going Left and the Chariot Racing scene, Comunità had variations of the Right Procession and Portonaccio had all six scenes. The other main ritual structure at Veii, Piazza d'Armi, did not have any of the VRV plaques. All four ritual structures on the plateau of Tarquinia during the sixth century had some VRV plaques. Ara della Regina and the Central Structure had the Left Procession and Banqueting plaques. The Civita Complex had the Banqueting scene. Santuario had a Procession scene, although the direction was not mentioned in the description. Four of the structures were destroyed by the middle of the fifth century BC (Santuario, Campetti, Comunità and the Central Structure). The Civita Complex went out of use in the fifth century BC. Portonaccio was restructured and redecorated at the end of the sixth century BC, and Ara della Regina was restructured and redecorated in the fourth century.

Table V.3. Distribution of VRV plaques

	Procession Left	Procession Right	Banqueting	Horseriding	Chariot Race	Seated Assembly
Veii:						
Campetti	×			×	×	
Comunità		×				
Portonaccio	×	×	×	×	×	×
Tarquinia:						
Ara della Regina	×		×			
Central Structure	×		×			
Civita Complex			×			
Santuario	×?	×?				
<i>Rome (various structures)</i>	×	×	×	×	×	
<i>Velletri</i>	×	×	×	×	×	×

The distribution of the Acquarossa-Tuscania plaques is as follows (see Table V.4): Acquarossa had all four scenes, Castellina del Marangone and the Civita Complex at Tarquinia had the Left Procession, and Tuscania had all four scenes, plus its own variations of both procession scenes; Piazza d'Armi had extremely similar Right Procession and Horseriding towards the left plaques. Poggio Buco contains two types of plaques which are very similar to this series with warriors going either to the left or right in each, and may have been produced by the same artists (see Andr  n 1940: pl 24, 25). Acquarossa and Castellina were destroyed in the second half of the sixth century BC. The Civita Complex and Piazza d'Armi gradually went out of use in the fifth century BC. The Ara del Tufo at Tuscania seems to have gone out of use centuries later.

Table V.4. Distribution of Acquarossa-Tuscania plaques

	Procession Left	Procession Right	Banqueting	Dancing
Acquarossa	●	●	●	●
Castellina del Marangone	●			
Civita Complex, Tarquinia	●			
Tuscania	●	●	●	●

The Civita Complex at Tarquinia was the only structure to have plaques from both series. Murlo and Caere's Vigna Parrocchiale are unique, in that they are the only structures which neither shared exact copies nor very similar frieze plaques with any other structures. Both Murlo and Vigna Parrocchiale had frieze plaques and other architectural decorations that shared similar themes with the other ritual structures described here. Their use of unique examples of the frieze plaques, however, suggests that these structures did not represent alliances with other areas.

Six of the ritual structures do not seem to have had any figured frieze plaques. These are: Castelnuovo Berardenga, Sant' Antonio, Valle della Mola and Montetosto,

Gravisca, as well as Punta della Vipera. These structures without frieze plaques lasted with varying success. Castelnuovo was destroyed in the early sixth century, Valle della Mola was restructured in the early fifth century, followed by Punta della Vipera in 540/520 BC. Sant' Antonio, Montetosto and Gravisca survived for many centuries. Both Montetosto and Gravisca are located at considerable distances from urban centres, and so have different circumstances at work.

2. THE THEMES

I have classified the themes represented in the frieze plaques into four main themes that dominate the scenes; they are: Warrior/Competition, Social Representation of Elites, Elite Private Life and Mythology. Most plaques contain more than one type of theme. The warrior elements have been defined by the presence of figures wearing helmets, and holding shields or other weapons. The Acquarossa-Tuscania procession scenes are a good example of this; however, the procession scene from Murlo has not been included in this group because the two figures holding knives do not seem to fulfil a warrior role, but rather seem to be attendants holding weapons in a ceremonial fashion. The element of competition, which includes horse racing and chariot racing scenes, has been tied to that of the warrior, because both are based on valorous activities. The category of social representation of elites was created to identify scenes that express the defining of elite social roles. The procession and assembly scenes do this largely. Both types of scenes are constructed in such a way as to depict the relative importance between the elites, as well as in relation to the non-elites or attendants. The procession (particularly the procession variants at Tuscania) and assembly scenes also include elements of ritual, which interestingly are not found in isolation. Elements of elite private life are evident primarily in the banqueting scene that depicts elite activities being carried out, which do not focus on distinguishing between elite roles. These scenes represent more of a glorification of the elite lifestyle in more private circumstances. Mythological elements in the scenes include Heracles, winged horses, sphinges and, possibly, Hermes.

A sample size as small as this cannot generate powerful statistics; however, percentages are presented here as a helpful means of viewing this matter efficiently (see Chart V.2). The fourteen ritual structures with figured frieze plaques contained a

total of 51 plaque types (many of which were found at more than one site). There were 27 uses of scenes related to Warrior or Competition, 26 related to Social Representation, 15 had Mythological elements and 13 had elements of Elite Private Life. There is a small number of others that have not been specifically identified by the excavators (see Chapter IV and Table V.2).

This pattern can also be viewed according to ritual structure, rather than in general, to see how isolated or mixed the scenes were. Of the fourteen ritual structures with figured frieze plaques, twelve (85.7%) of them contained warrior or competition themes. All fourteen of the structures contained scenes related to social representation. Another eleven (78.6%) contained mythological elements. Nine (64.3%) contained elements related to elite life or luxury. Four (28.6%) contained scenes with animals and no people.

A few distinct patterns can be seen in the combinations of themes within the frieze plaque scenes. The themes of warrior/competition and social representation dominate the other elements. Both are also usually found together (12 examples), although there is also an element of the mythological in scenes with both warrior/competition and social representation (10 of those 12 examples). Social representation and elite life are the next most common combination (10 examples); more specifically, elements of elite private life are never found without elements of social representation. The warrior/competition theme is the only theme that can be found in isolation in frieze plaque scenes (11 examples), including scenes of warriors walking or on horseback.

The procession scenes in particular from the VRV and Acquarossa-Tuscania series serve more than one purpose. The left procession from the VRV series and both processions from the Acquarossa-Tuscania series integrate warrior, elite and mythological elements. The use of three themes together acts to legitimise a proposed interaction between elites in their chariots leading and being led by warriors, all of which are connected to the divine with winged horses and Heracles (in the case of the Acquarossa-Tuscania plaques).

Campetti, Portonaccio and Ara del Tufo had an emphasis on the military/competition theme. In addition to procession scenes, the first two had the warriors on horseback and chariot racing scenes from the VRV series, while the latter had two different warriors on horseback scenes.

Seven of the ritual structures had frieze plaques that contained elements of all four themes. They are: Acquarossa, Ara della Regina, the Civita Complex, the Central Structure, Campetti, Portonaccio and Ara del Tufo. These structures were built from the second half of the seventh century to the early sixth century BC. With the exception of Ara del Tufo, which was left unchanged, five of the structures were destroyed or restructured without the use of the frieze plaques at the end of the sixth century BC (although it is difficult to say with certainty if the frieze plaques at Campetti were removed during the restructuring or destruction phase). The Civita Complex went out of use in the mid-fifth century BC, rather than being destroyed or restructured.

There does not seem to be, however, a clear pattern linking the general themes of the frieze plaques and the success or otherwise of the ritual structures. A different type of factor, such as the production centre of the plaques, may be more crucial to understand them (see Cristofani 1987b).

3. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NETWORKS

Veii and Tarquinia, or more specifically, the ritual structures at Veii and Tarquinia, were well-connected in the distribution of figured frieze plaques. In fact, three of the ritual structures at Veii and all four of the ritual structures at Tarquinia had at least some of the VRV series frieze plaques, so that the series could actually be called the Veii-Tarquinia-Rome-Velletri plaques. The one ritual structure at Veii which did not have VRV plaques, Piazza d'Armi, actually had procession and horseriding scene plaques which are extremely similar to those from the Acquarossa-Tuscania series. One structure at Tarquinia, the Civita Complex, is the only structure to have had frieze plaques from both the VRV and Acquarossa-Tuscania series.

Seven structures in all at Veii and Tarquinia had frieze plaques from the VRV series. The two structures which survived into the fifth century BC, Portonaccio and the Civita Complex, were also the only two structures in this group to have several building phases which included removing the VRV plaques at the end of the sixth century BC. All of the other structures were destroyed (although the Central Structure seems to have had a new life in the third century BC, after a break of several centuries).

At Tarquinia, both the Central Structure and Ara della Regina had the Left Procession and Banqueting frieze plaques from the VRV series; the Civita Complex had the Banqueting frieze, the Santuario also had a Procession plaque (it is not clear if it is the Left or Right). This makes an interesting link with Portonaccio, which is the only ritual structure to have both the Left Procession and Banqueting scenes (in addition to the other four VRV scenes). This adds to the weight of evidence pointing to Portonaccio as the production and distribution centre of the VRV series frieze plaques. The distribution of the Left Procession and Banqueting scenes, in particular, shows an economic way of covering the four themes discussed with only two types of plaques. The two scenes used in isolation may illustrate more continuity between the scenes than previously believed. Both scenes show two couples of a man and woman, which may actually depict the same two couples in the two different scenes. It is also interesting to note that Ara della Regina had a procession scene during its Archaic phase, which included winged horses pulling a biga; this must have been deemed an important theme to continue even after its restructuring and redecorating in the fourth century BC, with the use of the famous winged horses high-relief frieze, also attached to a biga (now held at the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Tarquinia).

The distribution of the Acquarossa-Tuscania series was not as wide. Castellina del Marangone had the Left Procession plaque and, as already mentioned, Piazza d'Armi had plaques similar to the series, which may have been made by the same artisans. This series may show that the distribution of the frieze plaques is not just about proximity. Castellina is nearest to Caere, and Tuscania is nearest to Tarquinia, and yet they did not share this form of architectural terracottas which were widely distributed throughout the region.

The distribution of figured frieze plaques illustrates bonds between many of the ritual structures across the region, related to warriors, elite representation in public, elite private life and mythological themes. Not only were these themes important to the elites, but a very exact way of expressing these issues was deemed necessary, and at the same time showed alliances with other groups and places. The frieze plaques must have been deemed appropriate and effective in their original contexts, to then be accepted for use elsewhere. The images depicting elite life, social order and a warrior presence used to adorn ritual structures, illustrate the multiple functions of the structures, and serve to legitimise the authority and activities of those in control of the structures.

The significance behind the movement of frieze plaques from the early Archaic has been overlooked largely. The production and trade of late Archaic statuary; however, has been investigated, and is a potentially useful reference point for the discussion here. It has been suggested that the exchange of coroplastic statuary in central Italy during the late Archaic period illustrates a gift-giving system between local elites, creating “a socio-political network of ties and obligations” (Glinister 2003: 141; see also Colonna 1987). This work, however, deals primarily with the slightly later development of emporia and their use of Heracles and Athena statues, and sees Caere as an epicentre of this action. The monumentalisation of ritual structures within the emporia is viewed as a ‘state-driven’ effort to control trade and contact with outsiders (Glinister 2003: 144). In a similar work, the development of rooftop statuary for temples, Heracles and Athena in particular, is seen as a means for local elites to follow fashionable trends, worship their chosen divinity and demonstrate their power (Lulof 2000: 217). Lulof eschews, however, any deep political meaning linking the symbolic characteristics of the statuary with the elites, such as Heracles and the tyrants. The elites involved in choosing the decorations for the temples at a given site, according to Lulof, potentially consisted of the king, the local ruling class, the religious elite, architects, craftsmen, coroplasts and tradesmen (Lulof 2000: 213). A wider group of people may have been involved in the commissioning of temples, particularly after 500 BC, such as the temples that Lulof discusses; however, ‘fashionable’ reasons seem to be potentially the least important factor if these

structures are viewed as “manifestations of local power” as Lulof states (Lulof 2000: 207).

The frieze plaques under discussion in this project are an earlier development, and as opposed to late Archaic statuary, show a different type of interaction of powerful individuals or groups, rather than collective settlements as Glinister suggests, or merely tied to the desires of fashionable elites as Lulof states. It is just as important to consider why ritual structures from the same settlement have different architectural decorations, as why ritual structures from different settlements have the same architectural decorations. When considering the ritual structures as a collection of many elements with the potentially multiple origins of the architectural decorations adorning them, the structures themselves represent a complex set of relationships between elites across the region. Many of the choices involved relate directly to creating or maintaining relationships with the elites within another settlement. The themes and symbols inherent in the decorations may relate more to expression of their bases of power than to the popularity of images.

The decoration of the ritual structures is one of the main keys to understanding the functions and responsibilities of the structures themselves and the individuals involved in their creation and maintenance. The frieze plaques contain specific symbols to communicate specific messages about authoritative statuses, and elite life in general. The themes express more than the activities of the elites; the iconographic elements within created well-defined expectations concerning the appearance of the elites. More specifically, images of objects, such as the *lituus*, axe and chariot used in the frieze plaques, mirrored the representations of authority in other contexts of social life. A major aspect of some of these symbols is that they, not coincidentally, relate to the divine realm as part of a deliberate conflation between the spheres, basing authoritative roles on god-like qualities through special duties, particularly related to ritual knowledge.

The iconography related to the ritual sphere must also be examined in light of the overlapping use of identical iconography in other spheres. It was through these multiple contexts that authoritative statuses could be constructed and communicated.

The use of particular iconographic symbols in other social spheres will be discussed in Chapter VI.

VI. ICONOGRAPHY RELATED TO POWER FROM OTHER CONTEXTS

A. EXTRACTING MEANING FROM FUNERARY AND SETTLEMENT CONTEXTS

Investigating the form and iconography of the ritual structures alone does not tell us everything about the functions of the structures and the individuals associated with them (see Chapter II.A.4, I.D for a discussion of iconography and the methodology used here). Fortunately, the iconographic elements contained within the architectural decorations on the ritual structures were not isolated examples of the use of symbols. They are composed of many powerful symbols that were also used in other social contexts. The meanings behind these symbols were created and transformed through their use in different settings and across time. During the Orientalising and Archaic periods in Etruria, new iconographic elements were adopted and adapted for the first time by elites and became a meaningful part of their existence. Many of the symbols were used in daily life and special occasions, as well as being used in the mortuary setting for funerary ceremonies and the final interment.

These other contexts are not without their problems, however (as discussed in Chapter I.C). Funerary evidence is crucial because of its potential to be well-preserved, and because it is part of an attempt to commemorate the identity and life of an individual. It is, of course, difficult to distinguish between the deceased individual's own efforts and those associated with him or her to commemorate the identity and life. Related to this is the problem of aggrandisement obscuring reality. However, even funerary evidence that has been affected by the aggrandisement of an individual's burial still shows which messages and forms of authority were deemed acceptable and desirable in non-funerary contexts. In these cases, the burial is still the result of choices made by those with a strong connection to the individual and possibly the individual him- or herself prior to death. These choices reflect how those associated with the deceased wanted the individual to be seen and remembered and possibly how the deceased wanted to be seen.

Settlement evidence, on the other hand, is poorly preserved, or has not been excavated. Examples of iconography from settlement contexts were sought for this project, but not found. Other types of settlement evidence, such as defences, irrigation projects, and the overall cohesion of the settlement structures, can help substantiate or clarify what evidence from other contexts indicates.

B. SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF ICONOGRAPHY IN MULTIPLE CONTEXTS

The iconography related to the identification of elites with authoritative statuses used in the ritual sphere has been found in many cases also in the funerary sphere. These symbols tell us how individuals probably associated with ritual structures and statuses were represented away from the ritual structures. In particular, the theme of social representation on the frieze plaques is a crucial insight into the ways in which roles and statuses were marked visually. The scenes of social representation functioned partly as a means of establishing, distinguishing and reinforcing important roles, many of which relate to authority. Many of the markers used in the images include hand-held objects, clothing and furniture. It is the hand-held objects, however, which probably pertain directly to the duties and responsibilities attached to many of the statuses being illustrated, and that will be focused on. The chariot will also be investigated because of its widespread use in imagery and as grave goods. Three symbols of particular importance, which were used at several sites, have been chosen to explore the meanings of the attached statuses; they are: *litui*, ceremonial axes and knives, chariots, as well as other objects with apparently divine associations.

1. THE *LITUUS*

The curved staff, referred to as the *lituus*, is an important symbol in Etruscan iconography. Its inclusion in burials suggests that the item was not a transferable symbol that could be passed on to, or inherited by another individual, but rather that it was something intrinsically connected to the deceased individual; this is particularly suggested by the inclusion of a *lituus* in the ash urn of Tomb A at Casale Marittimo, which will be discussed below.

A number of *litui* will be discussed in this section. There are two examples of actual *litui* that survived as grave goods from Etruria proper, and are made of precious materials of ivory or bronze, further indicating that this type of object marked the elite, prestigious status of its holder. Another two *litui* were found in votive deposits, dating to the early seventh century and mid-sixth century BC. By at least the 6th century, there are several instances of *litui* as images appearing on funerary *stelae* and architectural friezes. When examining the contexts of these objects and images it becomes clear that outside the funerary context, *litui* belong in the ritual sphere. Table VI.1 is as comprehensive as possible, to show the chronological progression within three types of contexts: funerary, ritual, domestic/settlement. The outlier in the table, representing the only possible domestic example, is the plaque from Murlo, adding to the argument for considering the monumental complex as a ritual structure.

The *lituus* can also be considered in light of classical literature. For instance, in *De Divinatione*, Cicero recounts the early use of the *lituus* in Rome (*De div* 1.30). He refers to the *lituus* as the most conspicuous mark of the priestly office, and that Romulus used a *lituus* to mark out the quarter for taking observations when he founded Rome. In Book I of *Ad urbe condita*, Livy recounts that when Numa Pompilius became king of Rome, an augur first had to take the auspices with the use of a *lituus*. Only then could the augur ‘read’ the signs from the gods and confer kingly power on Numa (Livy 1.18.7). These excerpts must be used cautiously because they are Roman sources from later dates. This additional perspective, however, is still interesting when used in conjunction with archaeological findings.

Actual *litui*

The only two extant *litui* from Etruria proper illustrate their importance, the first with its use of ivory and its placement, the second because of its craftsmanship. The inclusion of the ivory *lituus* from Tomb A, Casale Marittimo (VI.1.2), in the actual *dolium* of the burial indicates how intimate this item was in relation to the identity of the deceased (Esposito 2001: 53). The second example is a *lituus* from a tomb in the Banditaccia necropolis at Caere; it is an example of fine bronzework from the early sixth century; its exact context is unknown (VI.1.4) (Cristofani 1985: 251; *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 241).

Images of *litui* in tombs

Several images of hand-held iconographic items, including *litui*, were used to decorate the interior of the tombs and communicate messages to the funeral participants and/or the world of the afterlife. The well-known Tomba delle Statue, from Ceri (VI.1.1), dated to the early seventh century BC, is often mentioned as containing what is possibly the earliest image of a *lituus* in an Etruscan context. The reconstruction of the statue on the right is, however, questionable (Colonna and von Hase 1984: fig. 11 for reconstruction sketch, tables X-XII). The actual photographs of the statue show such a poor state of preservation, that the item held within the hand of the statue, which is described as a possible *lituus*, unfortunately seems unrecognisable. The statues are thought to represent the ancestors of the individuals buried in this tomb; more precise conclusions as to their identities or former roles would be impossible to reach (*Principi Etruschi* 2000:168; Barker and Rasmussen 1998:128). The identification of possible augurs in the eponymous *Tomba degli Auguri* (VI.1.14) has now been drawn into question; the figures holding curved staffs may also represent umpire figures for the surrounding games, or mourners and mourning priests (Steingraber 1985: 283, tomb 42 views the figures as mourners or mourning priests; Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 228 believe they may be umpires. The figures and scenes are discussed by Torelli (1997: 122-123).

Images of *litui* on urns

A number of funerary urns from the late sixth century BC depicts scenes including *litui*. Two urns in particular from Chiusi depict two different scenes. The first is an 'assembly scene', with three male figures seated on a raised platform; there is a standing male figure to the left of them, and a large group of standing figures to the right (VI.1.12) (Jannot 1984: fig. C, I, 8b). The middle seated figure holds a *lituus*, and most probably depicts an elite, authoritative figure. The other urn shows a scene of two pairs of male figures approaching each other. The figure second from the left holds a *lituus*, while the others hold staffs (VI.1.15) (Jannot 1984: fig. C, II, 35c). It is difficult to say if the figure farthest to the left is meant to represent the deceased, as has been suggested, or if there is a possible alternative reading of the *lituus* in this context. Another possible urn of unknown context, dated to the middle of the sixth

century BC, contains two figured scenes on separate sides of the object, each depicting a male figure holding a *lituus* (VI.1.8) (Jannot 1984: fig. B, I, 3). Unfortunately, this is so badly damaged that interpretation of the meanings of the scenes is impossible.

Images of *litui* outside tombs

From the early to middle of the sixth century BC, images of *litui* begin being found outside tombs as markers. The limestone *stèle* from Volterra (VI.1.6) (Catani 1988: 36; Torelli 2000a: 615, cat no. 249 “*Avile Tite*”), and a *cippus* referred to as one of the ‘Fiesole stones’ (VI.1.17) (Torelli 2000a: 592, no. 148), for instance, probably stood outside the tombs of prominent individuals. These markers were used as a permanent reminder of the statuses the individuals held, efficiently communicated through the use of the *lituus* as an iconographic symbol. Unfortunately, it is not known whether these two tombs contained an actual *lituus* inside, but it is possible that the use of the item and the roles of its bearers had changed by this period. It could be that the *lituus* was no longer deemed to be an appropriate grave good, or they were kept in circulation and passed on to the next individual to hold the position, but this is of course just speculation. Interestingly, a possible altar dating to the beginning of the fifth century BC may have also stood outside one or more tombs. It is a cylindrical monument which depicts a ‘sacrifice scene’ with several figures standing near an altar, two of which each hold a *lituus*. In addition, a ‘funerary lamentation scene’ is located on the other half of the monument (VI.1.18) (Jannot 1984: fig. D, I, 14).

Images of *litui* in frieze plaques

The frieze plaques from the Ara del Tufo, Tuscania (VI.1.9), Poggio Civitate, Murlo (VI.1.5) and Portonaccio at Veii (VI.1.11) all include images of the *lituus*. The frieze plaques from Velletri, as part of the VRV series, will not specifically be discussed here because it is outside Etruria proper; however, the same image will be discussed in its context at Veii. Similarly, the frieze plaques from Palestrina also contain an image of a *lituus*, but will not be discussed here because of their location outside Etruria proper, but it is interesting the symbol is also used in at least two places in Latium.

The location of the Tuscania structure in the necropolis suggests that its functions were largely connected with funerary and ritual. It is uncertain if the frieze plaques were placed on the outside or inside of the structure. The plaques are almost identical to the procession plaques from the 'monumental complex' at Zone F of Acquarossa, and the inclusion of the figure holding the *lituus* is one of the only additions to the particular scene (see Moretti Sgubini and Ricciardi 1993; Strandberg Olofsson 1993). It is possible that the *lituus* was a more powerful or salient symbol at Tuscania, or in the particular tomb the decorations are associated with. The 'assembly scene' frieze plaques from Murlo were placed along the interior courtyard of the 'monumental complex' found at the site (see Phillips 1968: 255-259, *Poggio Civitate* 1970, Hague Sinos 1994: 100-117). This scene has often been compared to the VRV 'assembly scene', which is interpreted by some to be a divine assembly, particularly because of the figure holding the *lituus*, which has been compared to Zeus (Gantz 1971; Andr  n 1974: 5), or conversely interpreted as an assembly of local leaders (Bruun 1993: 272-275; Cristofani 1975: 9-17; Mazzarino 1945: 67-80; Sch  fer 1989: 33-35) (see Chapter III.B.4). The view taken here is that the frieze plaques at both Murlo and Veii depict leaders, rather than divinities. These scenes were intended to portray the grandness of the local leaders through the use of iconography, not unlike those used by the gods, but rather emulating the appearance of gods through the use of specific iconographic symbols. The frieze plaque images are particularly effective in communicating messages concerning the 'order of things', depicting who the elites are, what they look like and what they do.

Litui found in votive deposits

The deposition of *litui* or statuettes holding *litui* in votive deposits illustrates the intimate connection between this symbol and its bearers, and ritual contexts. The bronze trumpet *lituus* from Votive Deposit A, Sector C.3 (fossa 284) Tarquinia (VI.1.3), is believed to have been made by an expert artisan from the East (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Trer   1997: 173; Torelli 2000a: 240, no. 276). Its ritual 'killing' and the context within the votive deposit under a sacred structure suggest its symbolic meaning was very significant. The bending of the item clearly marks the end of its existence as a trumpet and a *lituus*, rendering it unusable for those purposes.

The stylistically crude bronze figure from the Lapis Niger in Rome (VI.1.7), shows a probable augur figure holding a *lituus* (Torelli 2000a: 591, no. 146).

Related items:

Some of the items often referred to as *litui* may actually be better regarded as separate but related symbols, possibly associated with other spheres of social life. Jannot (1993) differentiates between the ‘sceptre’, the ‘baton recourbés’, the ‘*lituus*’, and the ‘cannes’. While I do not subscribe to his detailed distinctions, which appear to be based more on literature than on archaeological evidence, I agree that more than one type of object is present. Other hand-held items, such as *lagobola*, should not necessarily be grouped together with *litui*, because it is possible they are related to hunting. The *pietra fetida* urn (VI.1.13) is also questionable, with two figures holding items, including a sceptre-like object and a *lituus*/*lagobolon*-like object on the left, and a club and spear on the right (Jannot 1984: fig. C, I, 12). The figure on the left is interesting because of the combined use of the two objects; however, the animals in the middle of the scene make it more appropriate to consider this a hunting scene, with the *lagobolon* being used as a rabbit-hunting tool. In one case, the context of a seated assembly scene makes it seem probable that thick curved staffs had an administrative or ceremonial function, and should be termed as *litui*; however, in a particular urn from Chiusi (VI.1.10) (Jannot 1984, fig. B, II, 1b), their large size makes it possible that the items have different connotations and functions from *litui*. *Tomba Giocolieri* also contains a few questionable items including a naked youth holding a *lagobolon*, a bearded man with a knotted staff and a bearded man sitting on a *curule* stool holding a thin staff (VI.1.16) (Steingräber 1985: 310, tomb 70; Torelli 1997: 126). In this case, the *lagobolon* and knotted staff do not seem to refer to political or religious authority, and may simply relate to outdoor scenes; the thin staff and the *curule* stool probably do relate to political authority.

Apart from the use of *litui* in funerary contexts, they are only found in the ritual contexts of votive deposits and architectural decorations of ritual structures. The archaeological findings, along with the classical literature, suggest that a *lituus*-holder had ritual authority related to special skills necessary for sacred duties, specifically

augury. At a minimum, the discovery of *litui* from such a variety of contexts shows that it was not a symbol solely associated with divinities, such as *Zeus/Tinia*. The symbol of the *lituus* was used as an important marker of ritual authority, particularly for the augur. The images of figures holding *litui*, such as the assembly scenes from Murlo and the VRV series, then, are not necessarily depictions of divinities, and should be viewed in context with the other frieze plaque scenes.

Table VI.1 <i>Litui</i> and their images		Funerary			Ritual		Domestic/ Settlement
	Objects	Grave goods	Images inside tomb	Images outside tomb	Images on ritual structures	Votive deposits	Images of domestic structures
1	Tomb of the Seated Statues, Ceri, 690-670 BC		x unclear				
2 *	Tomb A, Casale Marittimo, early 7th cent.	x ivory <i>lituus</i>					
3 *	Fossa Votiva 284, Tarquinia, first quarter 7th cent.					x trumpet <i>lituus</i>	
4	Banditaccia, Caere, first quart 6th cent.	x <i>lituus</i>					
5 *	Assembly Scene frieze plaques, Murlo, first quart 6th cent.				x <i>lituus</i>	□	x
6	Stele, "Avile Tite", Volterra, mid 6th cent.			x <i>lituus</i>			
7	Bronze augur figure, Lapis Niger, Rome, 550 BC					x <i>lituus</i>	
8	Urn possibly, context unknown, 550 BC		x unclear				
9	Frieze plaques, Ara del Tufo, Tuscania, mid-late 6th cent.		x <i>lituus</i>	□	x		
10	Assembly Scene urn, Chiusi, third quarter 6th cent.		x <i>lagobola</i>				
11	VRV Seated assembly scene frieze, Portonaccio, Veii, 540- 500 BC				x <i>lituus</i>		
12	Assembly Scene urn, late 6th cent.		x <i>lituus</i>				
13	Urn possibly, context unknown, late 6th cent.		x <i>lagobolon</i> sceptre				
14	Painting, Tomba degli Auguri, Tarquinia, 520 BC		x <i>lituus</i>				
15	Urn, Chiusi, late 6th cent.		x <i>lituus</i>				
16	Painting, Tomba Giocolieri, Tarquinia, 510 BC		x <i>lagobola</i> staffs				
17	Cippus, augur figure, Fiesole, 6/5th cent.			x <i>lituus</i>			
18	Altar with sacrifice scene, beginning of 5th cent.		x 2 <i>litui</i>	□	x		

In the table, an 'x' simply marks the presence of one *lituus*, a '-' symbol was used in certain cases to show when the context of an item crosses into more than one category, and an '*' is by three of the items which will be discussed in greater detail because of their association with other symbols. The items can be seen in the figure section, labelled with the same number as used in the table (i.e. item VI.1.1 in the table is also figure VI.1.1).

2. CEREMONIAL AXES AND KNIVES

Ceremonial weapons are an important motif in Etruscan iconography. Of the nineteen examples discussed here, one is from the votive deposit at Tarquinia's Civita Complex, and the rest are from the funerary sphere. Because of this and the nature of axes and knives, Table VI.2 is organised differently from the previous table, categorising them by use, rather than context. A distinction is made here, first of all, between functional, non-decorated and non-precious tools, and those that are decorated and/or made of precious materials, the latter of which may be functional or non-functional, or both. Many of these items were made of precious materials, including ivory and amber, and often involved intricate artistry. It has been proposed that iron axes may have served as functional tools, and some bronze axes may have been chosen as ceremonial display items, but there are numerous exceptions to the rule. It is quite possible, as Esposito and others have suggested, that during this period iron took on connotations of a new strength and technology, while bronze may have been associated with more traditional and sacred uses (Esposito 2001: 54; cf. Snodgrass 1970 for a discussion of the transition from bronze to iron in Greece).

It is also problematic to define which items were functional in some cases, so here, the undecorated items will be labelled 'functional', and the elaborately decorated, sometimes completely non-functional items, will be labelled 'non-functional/ceremonial'. When the addition of decoration to an item, which is considered a weapon or tool by name, impedes its functionality, then its appearance was created to outweigh its functional value, and for these purposes will be considered 'ceremonial'. Images of the items will be considered as a third category in the table.

There are many examples of functional weapons in funerary contexts, going back at least as far as the Villanovan period, such as the Tomb of the Warrior at Tarquinia (VI.2.1) (Hencken 1968: 66-73; Strøm 1971: 141-149). At Poggio Buco, tombs dating from the early seventh to the mid-fifth centuries BC contained weapons (knives, axes, spearheads, etc.) only made of iron, while bronze was used only for items of personal ornamentation (fibulae, belt buckles, bracelets, etc.) (VI.2.4) (Bartoloni 1972; Matteucig 1951; Pellegrini 1989). In addition, the two iron knives or daggers from

Tomb A, Casale Marittimo (VI.2.6) (Esposito 2001: 52, *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 238, no. 267), the bronze axe from Trestina (VI.2.9) (Torelli 2000a: 620, no. 264), the iron double axe or *fascēs* from Vetulonia (VI.2.11) (Falchi 1898: 157, *PE* 241, cat. no. 278) and the bronze knife without context (VI.2.14) (*Principi Etruschi* 2001: 216, cat. no. 244) are also examples that may have been functional. Their symbolic value may be a simple straightforward illustration of strength and wealth. Functional examples of axes and knives are so numerous that only a few instances related to sites already discussed have been included (this should be considered while looking at Table VI.2).

Ceremonial axes

The bronze pendant of a miniature axe from Bologna (VI.2.2) certainly did not function as a real axe (*Principi Etruschi* 2000: 361-2, no. 515). Its miniaturisation is significant, beyond being an ornamental grave good, and could reflect a different use of the object in Bologna, possibly representing a more minor role in relation to an individual who bore a large axe (functional or non-functional), or could represent the status of an axe bearer without need of a true axe. Miniature versions of objects are also sometimes associated with children, but it is unclear in this case. The bronze axe from Chiusi, dated to the late eighth or early seventh century BC (VI.2.3), is so ornately decorated with ivory and amber that its main uses were probably ceremonial and ornamental, although its blade may have been able to cut (*Principi Etruschi* 2000: 238, cat. no. 268; Brogi 1875: 216-220). The bronze axe from Tomb A, Casale Marittimo (VI.2.6), is decorated with small bronze duck symbols along the spine of the handle, leaving room for only one hand to hold the object, and therefore probably also had more ceremonial value (Esposito 2001: 54, 60; *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 238, no. 269, pl. labelled 271). The bronze axes from Tombs H1 and H2 from Casale Marittimo (VI.2.7, VI.2.8) were definitely non-functional. The multiple axe heads, left to dangle freely, rather than being fused together, make the objects more ornamental display items (Esposito 2001: 57-60, *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 238, no. 270, 271, and pl. 269, 270). The bronze axe head from votive deposit (*fossa* 284) at Tarquinia (VI.2.5), has an elaborate design covering the entire object, rendering this axe ceremonial, even if its blade was sharp enough to cut (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 173, *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 238, cat. no. 274).

By the middle of the seventh century BC, these ‘weapons’ or ‘tools’ also began to be made of ceramic materials, such as the *bucchero* double axe from Tarquinia (VI.2.10) (Colonna 1973: 549, pl. CXXIIa, *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 241-242, cat. no. 279-280) and the impasto miniature hatchet from Sarteano (VI.2.12) (Maetzke 1993: 139-140, no. 2; Torelli 2000a: 583, cat no. 132). These items were created, probably not because they were more economical to produce, but because the symbolic meaning behind axes and knives had changed over time, perhaps differently at each settlement. These items may represent a heroic past or the complete ceremonialisation of the roles behind axe and knife bearers in certain contexts. The material and the function of the sign changed, while the signifier still communicated important messages. The locations and procedures of the rituals that included these items, such as sacrifices, assemblies and processions, are not fully known, but the related objects were important in funerary contexts throughout the eighth and sixth centuries BC.

Images of Axes

The images of axes and knives help fill in the gaps of information regarding the use, context and meaning of the objects, from the end of the seventh century BC. The funeral *stele* from Vetulonia depicting a helmeted figure holding a double axe or *fasces* (VI.2.13) is the earliest image of a *fasces* (*Principi Etruschi* 2000: 227). There is also the funeral *stele* from Fiesole, depicting a male figure holding an axe and a spear, with the name “*Larthie Ninie*” inscribed on the stone, depicting a specific individual, by using his name and special attributes to identify him as ‘Larthie Ninie’ (VI.2.17) (Bruni 1997: 38; Torelli 2000a: 76, cat. no. 564). The presence of both an axe and spear on a funeral *stele*, depicting probable elite figures, illustrates that the objects were being used to construct a particular message to communicate aspects of the identities of specific individuals. In the case of the former, the particular helmet and *fasces* communicated specific ideas about the individual’s status; his inscribed name would have also shown his important status. The paintings within the *Tomba dei Tori*, Tarquinia (VI.2.18), depict an example of a knife used in a ‘sacrifice’ of sorts (Steingraber 1985: 350, tomb 120). The Achilles figure waits in hiding with a knife, described as a ‘curved blade of sacrifice (the Greek *machaira*)’ (Spivey 1997: 76), not unlike the bronze knife mentioned above (IV.2.14), about to attack and murder the Troilus figure on horseback. Similarly, the paintings in the *Tomba*

Campana at Veii depict a male figure with a double axe with a mythological element, this time in the form of sphinges as part of a procession (VI.2.15).

Two of the frieze plaque scenes from Murlo (VI.2.16) also contain images of axes and knives (Phillips 1968: 255-259). The 'assembly scene' shows the second figure from the right holding a knife and spear, and the sixth figure from the right holding what looks to be a set of *fascēs*. As already mentioned above, I interpret the meaning of the scene to relate to an assembly of local leaders. The iconography used in the image is purposely constructed to substantiate the forming of special statuses. The plaque is described as depicting a "general message of power and prestige" (Rathje 1994: 95; see also Rystedt 1984: 371). The second figure is probably an attendant, holding the belongings of the first figure, who holds the *lituus*. It is an interesting message that the first figure holds the *lituus* as his primary symbol, while the knife and spear, held by the attendant, are included in the image to create an association between the figure and the other symbols. The *fascēs* holder sits in a similar *curule* stool, as the first two seated figures, with a less elaborate footrest, and so may be imagined to represent a figure of less importance in the assembly context. The *fascēs* are his identifying feature, and are used to form an ideal image of the roles synonymous with the holder of the *fascēs*.

The frieze plaque known as the 'procession scene' at Murlo shows the first figure from the left holding what looks like a knife (Figure IV.15) (also called a 'cleaver' by Rathje 1985: 125-127). This scene has been interpreted in a number of ways, including a procession related to a funeral journey (Andrén 1971), a wedding (Butterworth 1970), travelling to a sanctuary (Gantz 1974), or dynasts of the area (Cristofani 1975). The inclusion of the knife in the scene was probably meant to communicate something specific, possibly indicating the connection of the Murlo structure to sacrifice or banqueting, but it is impossible to say. Hague Sinos states that what 'the procession frieze does suggest is that the building was associated in some way with men who not only belonged to the world of aristocratic banquets and horses, as depicted in the other frieze plaques, but also sought to manifest themselves as recipients of divine honour, as indicated by the divine attendants as well as royal attributes in the procession scene' (Hague Sinos 1994: 113). I do not see any reason

to view the attendants as divine; however, I do agree that there is an intentional association with divine attributes in the seated assembly scene, which acts as a means of elevating and legitimising elite statuses (see Chapter III.B).

What is interesting here is the idea of transforming weapons and tools into decorative, ceremonial symbols, often rendering them non-functional. This change suggests that the roles of the axe- and knife- bearers may also have been transformed. These new items suggest that certain individuals no longer needed functioning weapons and tools for fighting, hunting, felling trees, etc. A certain level of wealth and prestige is also associated with the axes and knives, judging by the associated grave goods. It is also possible that non-functioning weapons indicate a change in ideology and social structure, indicating a decrease in a potential coercive aspect of authority in some cases. Each site, in fact, seems to show a different development of these symbols. At Poggio Buco, for instance, in the necropolis of the settlement Statonia, all of the weapons used as grave goods were made of iron (Matteucig 1951; Bartoloni 1972).

This mixture of ‘weapon for killing’ and a ‘beautiful ornament for public display’ is a stark juxtaposition of qualities; however, it succinctly encapsulates an image of power and wealth. It seems to act as a reminder of the great strength and power behind the individual, which is at the same time restrained. The deposition of numerous axes and knives in burials illustrates that the items were directly associated with the deceased, and the grand nature of the burials indicates the elevated elite status of the deceased. All of these factors suggest a transformation of valorous authority at many of these settlements, at least making it more visible in the archaeological record. A twist is added by the fact that many of the ceremonial axes and knives have been interpreted as sacrificial tools. This may be problematic, however. There is an almost complete absence of early Etruscan imagery or writing, which have or describe the act or tools involved in sacrifice. One sarcophagus from Chiusi, dating to c.550 BC, depicts a sacrifice about to occur near an altar with three male figures each holding a knife (VI.2.19) (Jannot 1984: fig. B,I, 5a). Much later Etruscan imagery of sacrifice usually shows swords or knives, rather than axes, being used. Several Hellenistic urns, however, show double axes with sacrificial, or potentially murderous scenes, such as the Judgement of Paris, each with Cassandra wielding a double axe (Figure VI.2.20)

(Steuernagel 1998: fig. 115, 118, 122, 128 in 'Wiedererkennung des Paris' and 301, 304 in 'Schlachten im Heiligtum'). The choice of scenes may relate more to later Hellenistic tastes; however, the inclusion of the double axe may show the infusion of a particular Etruscan symbol. The introduction of multiple axe heads, for instance double axes, may relate to a larger phenomenon. It is possible that axes such as these are the forerunners of Roman *fascēs* held by the lictors (see Chapter III.A.3 for a discussion of Tassi Scandone's work on the differences between Etruscan and Roman *fascēs*). Livy states that twelve lictors accompanied Romulus, each holding double axes in bundles of rods (1.8.2). It is interesting that Silius Italicus states that *fascēs* originally came from the Etruscan town of Vetulonia, considering that this is the location of the so-called *Tomba del Littore*, which contained a double axe with a handle made of multiple rods, dated to 630-625 BC (VI.2.11), and the associated funeral *stèle* with a *fascēs* image (VI.2.13) (Punica 8.485).

The axes and knives show important transformations in a symbol used to identify authoritative individuals. Axes and knives, of course, originated as functioning tools and weapons. Their elevation to marking an authoritative status probably began with the association of certain individuals with these objects as tools and weapons, and therefore symbolised valorous authority. Ceremonial and non-functional versions of axes and knives indicate that any valorous connotations may have been only symbolic. The use of axes and knives in combination with other symbols demonstrates that they were not only used in isolation. Once again the discovery of axes and knives as grave goods shows that images of figures holding these items do not have to be necessarily interpreted as divinities, such as Dionysos. These were symbols used by elites to express the types of authority they held.

Table VI.2. Ceremonial Axes and Knives

	Objects	Possibly Functional	Ceremonial/ Non-Functional	Images
1	Tarquinia, Tomb of the Warrior, 750-700 BC.	2 bronze axes		
2	Bologna, mid 8-early 7th cent.		1 bronze axe pendant	
3	Chiusi, ziro tomb- via Cassia, late 8-early 7th cent.		1 bronze, ivory, amber axe	
4	Statonia, Poggio Buco Necropolis, First quart 7th-mid 5th cent.	knives, axes, spears only in iron		
5*	Tarquinia, Fossa 284, <i>edificio beta</i> , first quart 7th cent.		1 bronze axe	
6*	Casale Marittimo, Tomb A, first quart 7th cent.	2 iron knives	1 bronze axe	
7	Casale Marittimo, Tomb H1, second quart 7th cent.		1 bronze axe-3 heads	
8	Casale Marittimo, Tomb H2, second quart 7th cent.		1 bronze-2 heads	
9	Trestina, Axe 7th cent.	1 bronze axe		
10	Tarquinia, Tomb on Poggio Gallinaro, mid 7th cent.		2 <i>bucchero</i> -double axe	
11	Vetulonia, Tomba del Littore, 630-625 BC	1 iron <i>fascēs</i>		
12	Sarteano, miniature clay hatchet, 630-601 BC		1 impasto	
13	Vetulonia, Funeral stele end of 7th cent.			1 <i>fascēs</i>
14	Context unknown, 7-6th cent.	1 bronze knife		
15	Veii, Tomba Campana, 600 BC			1 double axe
16*	Murlo, Poggio Civitate c 600 (frieze plaques)			2 knives 1 <i>fascēs</i>
17	Sandstone stele, " <i>Larthie Ninie</i> ", Fiesole, first half 6th cent.			1 axe
18	Tarquinia, Tomba dei Tori, mid 6th cent. (painting)			1 knife
19	Chiusi, Urn with sacrifice scene, 550 BC			3 knives

In Table VI.2, the number of each axe or knife found in each case is listed in the box, and an '*' in the far left column marks three items that will be discussed in greater depth in the next section because of their association with other symbols. The items can be found in the figure section, under the same number as used in the table.

3. THE CHARIOT

There are over 250 burials in Italy from the Orientalising and Archaic periods which contain chariots or chariot parts, 102 of which are found within Etruria. The chariot was an important and widespread symbol used in the funerary sphere, just as in the majority of figured frieze plaques from the ritual sphere. The term 'chariot' will be used here for convenience, but this includes a variety of types: two-wheeled *bighe* and *calessi*, three-wheeled *trighe* and four-wheeled *quadrighe* and carts (Emiliozzi 1999).

Forty-two, or 41.1%, of the tombs with chariots from Etruria, come from the sites discussed in this project, which have ritual structures during the period in question. A number of these also contained armour and weaponry, such as helmets, shields, swords and spears. Twenty-eight burials with chariots came from Veii, nine of which also contained armour, ten from Tarquinia, three of which also contained armour, three from Caere, one of which contained armour, one from Castelnuovo di Berardenga which also contained armour, and two from Poggio Buco which did not contain armour. This indicates that the chariot is not solely identified with warrior and competitive connotations, and so was not consistently found with armour and weaponry. Twenty-three (22.5%) of the burials in Etruria with chariots are believed to belong to women, some of which contained armour and weaponry (Figure VI.3.2). This supports the impression provided by three of the figured frieze plaques of procession scenes from the VRV and Acquarossa-Tuscania series, as well as Murlo, which show both genders using chariots and carts (see Chapter IV) (Figures VI.3.1).

The chariot is considered a major component of the ideology of the aristocracy, illustrating their elite status and *tryphé*, or luxurious lifestyle, as well as being a step above having horses, according to Colonna. The main function of the chariot, he states, is to make the aristocratic male [although seemingly both male and female, as discusses above] more mobile, enabling him to oversee his land and army from which he has gained his economic and powerful statuses. The *calesse*, or gig, allows for faster and more comfortable journeys; the four-wheeled carts are often associated with the funeral journey to the tomb (Colonna 1999: 21; Delpino 2000: 224). The chariot itself, then, functioned as and symbolised the luxury of elite life, more than warrior and competitive activities. Its use was based not on valorous authority in

particular (or special skills for that matter), but rather was an important accessory for many different types of authoritative figures.

4. OTHER OBJECTS WITH DIVINE ASSOCIATIONS

In addition to *litui* and axes, other objects, or rather images of objects, are associated with mythological figures, including divinities, in classical iconography. Because of this, their appearance is often automatically and inappropriately interpreted as identifying divinities in such things as figured frieze plaques and vase paintings. Some of these objects are not as common as those discussed above, but deserve a brief discussion.

a) FRUIT AND FLOWER-LIKE OBJECTS

Three of the frieze plaque scenes contain figures holding flower or fruit-like objects. The banqueting scenes from the VRV series and Murlo depict female figures reclining, with these objects held upwards in a posed gesture. The flower or fruit objects in the seated assembly scene at Murlo, however, have been interpreted as pomegranates, in order to argue that the figures in the scene are divine, and that the two figures with these objects in particular are identified as Demeter and Persephone (Gantz 1971: 19). However, the interpretation of the objects in the Murlo seated assembly scene as pomegranates is problematic. The frieze plaques are worn in many areas, which have left these parts damaged. Also similar objects appear in the banqueting scenes at Murlo and Acquarossa; however, since these plaques are not interpreted as divine scenes, the fruit or flower like objects are not discussed. Similarly, the 'Boccanera' painted plaques from a mid-sixth century tomb in the Banditaccia necropolis at Caere depicts two female figures holding branches bearing pomegranates (Figure VI.3.3). The scenes depicted in these plaques however, have been interpreted as the Judgement of Paris, or a scene of Theseus and Ariadne, in which case the two female figures have been interpreted as maidens saved from the Minotaur, or as a general 'hero's reception' (Spivey 1997: 90-91). These plaques demonstrate how widely varied the interpretations can be, and which do not necessarily correlate with specific identities.

The interpretation of pomegranates is even more problematic, however, due to the discovery of fruit and flower ornaments used as grave goods in central Italy during the Orientalising and Archaic periods, which illustrate that these symbols were used by aristocratic Etruscans for themselves and were not involved exclusively (or even at all) with the divine. Tomb 1 from the tumulus at Montetosto, dating to the first half of the seventh century BC, contained a female inhumation burial, which included a fruit or flower-shaped *plectrum* made of ivory and laminated in gold, also dating to the second half of the seventh century BC (Figure VI.3.4) (*Principi Etruschi* 2000: 244, no. 285; Rizzo 1989: 154). The materials the object is made of indicate its luxury status. Its function as a *plectrum* associates it with the refined aristocratic atmosphere of music and banqueting. Its shape, to be held in the hand by the stem, likens it and its holder to a goddess holding a fertility symbol, as suggested for the Murlo banqueting frieze plaque. Another bone *plectrum* dating to the first half of the sixth century from Montalto di Castro, in Tomb 1 (a female inhumation) from the Pian dei Gangani area, is also shaped like a fruit or flower (Rizzo 1990: 126, no. 28). These and other similar items, referred to as *cucchiai*, or spoons, also in ivory or wood, which were part of the elite female toiletry kit, indicate these small hand-held objects were part of the female sphere (Jurgeit 1982: 57). There is also a sceptre with a fruit or flower-shaped finial made of gold and silver from the Tomba Barberini at Palestrina from the seventh century BC (Figure VI.3.5) (Emiliozzi 1999: 313, no. 24; *Principi Etruschi* 2000: 224). This, however, was from a male burial dating to the first quarter of the seventh century. The additional grave goods of a two-wheeled chariot, spears axes, shields and a sword, make this a so-called warrior burial. This tomb is not from Etruria, but is briefly mentioned to show another type of this category of object. These grave goods indicate that hand-held fruit and flower-like objects are not necessarily only associated with divinities through images; they were a popular, if limited, motif for both aristocratic women and men.

b) THE SCEPTRE

The sceptre is often associated with male divinities, Zeus in particular. Even the thunderbolt Zeus is sometimes depicted with in bronze statuary takes the appearance of a sceptre (Cook 1914: 86). Of course the sceptre is also associated with rulers, and is accepted more readily as an object adopted by ruling elites to emulate the gods,

than *litui* and double axes have been (cf. Gantz 1971). This item is probably also a symbol of authority, like the *lituus* and axe, but because there are so few, it is difficult to describe the nature of the authority.

Tomb 871 from the Casale del Fosso necropolis of Veii contained a gold sceptre, dated to the last quarter of the eighth century BC, now lost. The excavator actually referred to it as a *lituus*, but the description of a '*pomo*' or round terminus, without any mention of a curvature, makes it sound more like a sceptre (Colini 1919: 12).

The VRV 'seated assembly' scene frieze plaque, dated to the last forty years of the sixth century BC, depicts two of the seated figures as holding sceptres (Figure VI.3.6). The first seated figure holding a sceptre has been identified as Zeus, and the other as an unidentified god (Åkerström 1954), or slightly differently as within a group of anonymous gods (Gantz 1971: 8). Within this project, this scene has been identified as a group of authoritative individuals, and not divinities (see Chapter III.B. 4.3).

The late sixth century urn depicting two male figures each holding two handheld objects is questionable (see section B.1 of this chapter; Jannot 1984: fig. C, I, 12). The figure on the left holds both a sceptre and a *lituus* or *lagobolon* (Figure VI.3.7). The identification of the latter is made difficult because of the apparent hunting nature of the scene. The scene may be read in a more interesting way, if the figure on the left is seen as an authoritative individual in the ritual and political spheres, identified by two official attributes, the sceptre and *lituus*, while the figure on the right is seen as a hunter or an authoritative individual in a more valorous social sphere, identified by the club and spear. There is no reason to identify the individual on the left as a divinity.

The wall paintings from the *Tomba Giocolieri* at Tarquinia, dated to 510 BC, include a man seated on a *curule* stool holding a thin staff or sceptre (Figure VI.3.8) (see section B.1 of this chapter; Steingraber 1985: 310, tomb 70). These two objects are often used together in scenes of divinities; however, there is nothing else about this

rural scene to suggest that it depicts anything other than a scene from Etruscan life; the figure may represent an authoritative figure.

The gold and silver sceptre of the Tomba Barberini at Palestrina with the fruit-like finial, dated to the first quarter of the seventh century (as described in the section above), is another example of a sceptre found in a funerary context, attesting to its non-divine function (*Principi Etruschi* 2000: 224; Emiliozzi 1999: 313, no. 24). The precious metals it is made of indicate that it was an important status marker. This item is just briefly mentioned here as being contemporary with those from Etruscan contexts.

C. A CLOSER LOOK AT THE INTEGRATION OF THE SYMBOLS

In certain instances, the different symbols were found together, in either object form or within iconography. This seems to be a very telling way of examining how the symbols interacted together to express combinations of meanings. The *lituus* and ceremonial axes and knives will be focused on because of their possible connections with authoritative statuses. Two of the symbols, a *lituus* and an axe, were found together in one example, and the *lituus*, chariot, axe and knife are found together in an additional two instances. They are 1) *Fossa Votiva* 284, *edificio beta*, Tarquinia, 2) Tomb A, Casale Marittimo and 3) the frieze plaques from Poggio Civitate, Murlo. Neither of the ornamental fruit or flower objects was found in association with *litui*, ceremonial axes and knives, or chariots.

First, the joint votive deposits from the Civita Complex at Tarquinia, dating to the first quarter of the seventh century BC, found in Settore C, area C3 (*edificio beta*, *fossa* 284 A,B), show the use of both a *lituus* and a ceremonial axe in a votive deposit, in a sacred area. This demonstrates that the two objects were involved in the ritual foundation of the 'monumental complex'. The trumpet feature of the *lituus* adds another dimension of possibly different ritual roles and functions normally associated with the *lituus*. The votive deposits, on the other hand, should be considered as a whole entity. There seem to be several different purposes attached to these deposits.

The presence of a *bucchero* kylix and animal bones indicates that the deposit was partly the result of sacrifices and libations (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 65). The ritually 'killed' bronze shield and the other bronze objects from the deposit are defining features of elite status, which demonstrate an emphasis on valorous authority. The panoply of banqueting equipment, deposited as a set of two, arguably indicates, as the excavators suggest, that the deposits were created by and for two main personages controlling the complex. The structure in question, termed a 'monumental complex', or a 'città regia', seems to have combined political, religious and banqueting functions (Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997: 175).

Second, the example of Tomb A at Casale Marittimo shows a two-wheeled chariot, an ivory *lituus* and a ceremonial axe together in a funerary context. This indicates that one individual could own all three objects and, therefore, also hold the roles and statuses associated with them, and that it was important to represent this in the burial, at least in the first quarter of the seventh century at this site. The later inhumation burials of tombs H1 and H2 suggest this was not true afterwards, or perhaps the ritual status or way of displaying the ritual status was considered less important in comparison with valorous statuses, indicated by the absence of *litui*, but inclusion of more elaborate ceremonial axes.

The progression of these burials illustrates how the authoritative elites at this site represented their statuses. The individual from Tomb A was probably the first individual from this group to hold an elevated, authoritative position. He and those who buried him saw the need to make this burial exceptional, and clearly demonstrate his special statuses through particular symbols. The bronze chariot shows his wealthy, aristocratic position. The *lituus* suggests that he held a priestly status, possibly associated with divination. The axes and knives, both functional and non-functional, indicate that he participated in activities, such as hunting, public ceremonies and possibly ritual sacrifices as the slayer or ceremonial figure. The other two graves of young men in tombs H1 and H2 show a similar use of symbols. The absence of chariot parts and *litui* in these two may indicate lesser elite and priestly statuses, but the elaboration of the ceremonial axes indicates the creation of a hierarchy between the individuals involved in the related activities. The increased elaboration of the

ceremonial axes suggests that finer distinctions needed to be made between the axe holders.

Third, the frieze plaques from Poggio Civitate, Murlo show images of one *lituus*, one *fascēs*, one two-wheeled cart and two knives, as decorative elements to the ‘monumental complex’ at the site. The presence of these items within the frieze plaques, which ran along the interior courtyard of the structure, was used purposely to communicate to visitors from the same settlement or another, information concerning the functions of the structure, as well as the roles and statuses of the individuals located there. Despite the debates pertaining to the exact meanings of the scenes, whether they are images of deities or humans, they certainly depict images of power. Despite the connections that Gantz (1971) draws between the Murlo ‘assembly scene’ and other scenes of deities, such as associations between Zeus and the *lituus*, Athena and the spear, Hera and the shroud, Dionysos and a double axe, Persephone and the pomegranate; other items, such as the cart, *lituus*, double axe and fruit-like objects, in particular, these objects can be easily attributed to (mortal) individuals in the region during this period, as shown above (see Chapter III.B.4). The similarity of these objects with attributes of deities is no coincidence, since the individuals who bore these objects intentionally likened themselves to the gods. The use of images of these objects within this palace-like structure made a direct connection between the structure itself, the individuals associated with it, and the deities.

The cart in the procession scene particularly demonstrates the aristocratic, luxurious lifestyle of certain individuals associated with the structure. The first figure to the right in the seated assembly scene shows that he is associating himself with both special skills and valorous authority, based on ritual and warrior roles, with an emphasis on the former because he holds the *lituus* himself, but allows an attendant to hold a sword and spear at the ready. This makes a nice parallel with Tomb A at Casale Marittimo, because the *lituus* was included in the ash urn with the remains of the deceased and was possibly included in the actual cremation process, while the other items, including weapons, were placed outside the urn. The figure in the frieze plaque portrayed with a double axe is associated with valorous authority, but seems to be of lower rank because of this relative position and his less-ornate footstool.

D. CONCLUSIONS

By seeing that particular iconography related to elite life and the development of authority can be found in multiple contexts and in multiple forms, it is evident that certain themes were issues in life, as well as in death. Constructing and maintaining the personae of authoritative individuals were a continuous process. Because of this, aggrandisement is a possible factor in both spheres. It is not just funerary contexts where individuals can attempt to raise their social importance. The frieze plaques with divine and mythological elements also elevated the statuses of the elites, by associating themselves with more powerful, immortal beings. The ideology of those associated with the ritual structures was shared by those represented in the elite funerary sphere, both as the burier and the buried. Rather than viewing this as problematic, it should be viewed as adding to the continuity of extracting meaning from the archaeological record. These findings have helped establish that this period was one marked by competition in more than one sphere of Etruscan society.

The seventh and sixth centuries BC should be viewed as a transitional period across the region as a whole, with iconographic items developing for personal embellishment. Some of these items became widely accepted enough in representing certain sets of ideas and messages by the middle of the sixth century, to be used in image form. Widespread use of an iconographic item in image form shows the end of an establishment period. Altering the form or material of the icon shows a renegotiation of its symbolic meaning. Changing the item, so that only the shape is recognisable, by changing the material, size and thereby removing its previous main function, can indicate that the roles attached to the bearer of the icon have also become more symbolic. In this case, the axes and knives became symbolic attributes in some instances, possibly when those individuals were no longer involved in the physical act of slaying (for sacrifices or in battle, etc.), but were rather in charge of overseeing the act.

I suggest that the *lituus* and axe relate very directly to the creation and further development of authority based on special skills and valour. The symbols were used

as markers of authoritative statuses. The *lituus* was an important symbol of special skills, related to the supernatural. Originally its holder was probably seen as an important, authoritative individual with a connection to the divine, possibly capable of understanding or affecting the future. The use of the *lituus* developed additional meanings related to administrative authority, seen in the 'assembly scenes'. The ceremonial axes and knives could possibly combine the symbolism of both valorous and specially skilled authority. The tools are weapons, whether real or ceremonial; their use, however, is in connection to authority, and possibly the divine. When the *lituus* and ceremonial axe are found in isolation, the intended meaning of each was probably clearly defined; combinations of the two represented a merging of these statuses. The *lituus* and the ceremonial axes and knives continued to evolve in Rome as powerful symbols.

The power of these, and other, iconographic symbols rests in the ability to augment elevated statuses. In a way, it is not enough for an individual seeking an authoritative position to have special skills, valour, economic leverage, or political ability; instead the individual must generate the identity associated with that status through the help of particular symbols. Across Etruria, these symbols were used differently indicated by varying numbers of each found, as well as their juxtaposition with different symbols at the sites. This indicates that Etruria consisted of unique settlements, with different types of power structures and authoritative roles during this period.

It is only through a long-term and multi-contextual approach that these issues can be investigated. All spheres of social life are equally important potentially, in reflecting social structure, including the statuses involved and the circumstances behind their transformations. Iconography used within this type of framework is an insightful means of exploring the creation and distinction of different authoritative statuses, particularly during a period of dramatic social change.

VII. INTERPRETATIONS

The object of this chapter is to interpret the findings from the previous two chapters—which dealt with the development of authoritative statuses through the formation of settlements, in particular the monumentalisation of ritual structures, and iconographic systems for the developing elites—and presents the results of this analysis. It will be argued here that the particular development of each settlement and the iconography present relates directly to the character of authority at each, also demonstrating the variability across the region, rather than homogeneity. Several points of discussion will be examined in this chapter. First, is a review of some of the major hypotheses concerning the development of social complexity for the Etruscans, which can now be reconsidered in light of the data produced here. Then, an alternative set of interpretations will be put forward regarding the social developments in general. The sites will be examined separately in terms of the use of iconography as a reflection of the development of authority at each. This will be followed by a look at the parallel development of the settlements and ritual structures, as well as the development of votive deposits. The progression of many of these changes into the fifth century BC will also be briefly considered. Finally, the last section explores how the development of authority in Etruria can be understood historically, and how a meaningful terminology for social development can be charted.

A. CRITIQUE OF HOW ETRUSCAN SOCIETY IS OFTEN VIEWED

Much of the recent work done on Archaic Etruscan society has relied on generalising at a regional level, as to the development of social hierarchies and the potential power bases of the elites. Torelli and Menichetti, in particular, state that gradual social inequalities beginning in the Early Iron Age resulted in elites with regal statuses, which passed through familial lines, including an emphasis on ancestors, real or imagined. Both also consider the monumental complexes to have been centres of public and private life, blurring the distinction between the two. As part of this,

Torelli and Menichetti suggest that the iconography integral to the structures displayed the statuses of the elites and their lifestyles.

On a broad level, Torelli is concerned with all of the critical areas of social change during the Archaic period. Many of his conclusions, however, are generalisations based on specific data from various separate sites. It would be more appropriate to avoid generalising, and instead acknowledge the unique characteristics at each site, as well as the similarities. Investigating complexity at the intra-site level is necessary to understanding the social developments behind the events that Torelli discusses. Menichetti, on the other hand, bases many of his assumptions concerning social complexity on classical literature and parallels with events in the Greek world. Both of these sources are inappropriately used without comparative archaeological evidence.

Torelli states that the development of aristocrats dramatically changed the social order by deconstructing the village community to create a new socio-political order embodied in the urbanisation of the settlements (Torelli 1988: 57). In a general way, I agree that these processes did occur; however, it was on a different time scale than Torelli suggests, with a less straightforward path. After investigating sites such as Caere, Tarquinia and Veii for this project, it seems that urbanisation at a centrally organised level took place after a period of competition between groups of elites within and between many of the sites. Many building projects took place during this period including the construction of ritual complexes, *cuniculi*, streets leading to the structures, roads down into the valleys to neighbouring settlements and large tumuli. The organisation of the labour, however, does not reflect a singular leadership of a centralised power structure, at least not until the end of the sixth century or even the early fifth century in many cases.

For Torelli, the construction of the monumental complexes or *regiae* epitomises the major changes beginning in the Villanovan period, in relation to funerary practices, economy, social structure and ideology. The structures themselves represent the creation of elevated social statuses with regal roles, which are celebrated in the architectural decorations. He does not, however, discuss why these social changes

took the form they did, or if the architectural decorations are a realistic reflection of the elites associated with the structures. The former issue is extremely difficult to tackle, particularly at many of the sites where the evidence is very piecemeal. It is possible to say, however, that once the elites did begin to develop, changes in funerary practices and the building of ritual complexes, both of which included a new system of iconography to express the elite ideology, began as a means of expressing and justifying their new statuses to other elites, as well as non-elites. By comparing the use of iconography and artefacts (grave goods and objects found in association with the structures) in the funerary and ritual spheres, as part of this project, it is clear that the same types of messages related to identifying the statuses of those wielding power, as well as aristocrats expressing their wealth and luxury, were present in both contexts.

Torelli also goes on to suggest that the architectural terracottas at Murlo and Acquarossa exemplify how the ideology and the instruments of religious consensus were used by the elites (Torelli 1997: 113; 2001: 69). It is not just religious (or sacred) instruments and authority; however, that is demonstrated in the decorations. More interesting is the combination of activities and types of authority that are depicted in the figured frieze plaques. The seated assembly scene at Murlo, in particular, depicts a group of elite individuals composed in a manner to emulate a divine assembly, each holding a symbol to distinguish him or her from the others. The symbol of ritual authority, the *lituus*, is shown first, as potentially the most important. The spear and sword suggest a valorous status (of secondary importance to the same individual), and the double axe suggests a more ceremonial valorous status of an individual at a lower level of authority because of his position within the scene.

Menichetti, however, views the architectural decorations at ritual complexes, particularly the statuary, as a reflection of the power bases. The statuary at Murlo, according to Menichetti, is an indication of power based on *manus*, in the manner of a *pater familias* displaying ancestral images, and those at the Regia in Rome as an indication of the power of the *rex*, through the use of mythological figures. The statuary at Murlo, however, includes both statues of possible ancestor figures, as well as *sphinges* and other mythological figures. These two elements of past figures, real

or imagined, and mythological figures are not easily separable for this period, and all played key roles in the legitimisation of elite statuses and ritual activities (Menichetti 2000: 221-224). Anthropologists suggest that the perception of ancestors often enters into the realm of the divine. It is not necessary to make distinctions between images of ancestors and mythological figures, including divinities. To investigate differences in the authority expressed through the statuary at Murlo and the Regia, we need to consider the other elements of the structures for a wider context.

Both Torelli and Menichetti stress that the authority was of a regal type during the Archaic period, developed from authority akin to the *pater familias* concept. A social transformation occurred, according to Torelli, in 500 BC, when the monarchies were replaced with republican magistrates, with non-gentilitial sacred buildings and large urban temples with votive deposits. Torelli, as well as Menichetti, state that the process of isonomy, or a process of equalizing the rights and privileges for individuals in a society, was underway by this point, particularly evident in the creation of votive deposits. Similarly, the new architectural decorations of the ritual structures indicate changes in the ethical and political atmospheres (Torelli 1983: 477-478; Menichetti 2000: 205, 224).

This insistence on the presence of isonomic trends is largely based on potential parallels with events in the Greek world, particularly the overthrowing of the tyrants at Athens in 510 BC (see Morris 2000: 186). This insistence that all major trends began in the East with eventual repercussions in Italy results in distorting findings in Italy to match unjustified expectations. The terms 'monarchies' and 'republican magistrates' have very specific and narrow connotations, which are inappropriately applied to the Etruscans. Many of the settlements do not seem to have been controlled by one individual, family or group during the early Archaic period, but rather by many different factions, as mentioned above. After 500 BC, however, familial connections were probably still an active factor behind the ability to gain at least some, authoritative statuses.

This idea of a 'replacement' of the powerful elites also gives a misleading impression of a new group of people being present. At sites such as Caere, Tarquinia and Veii,

which did survive after 500 BC, the destruction of many of the ritual structures at each site, and the continuation of a small number of ritual areas after a period of restructuring, give the impression that particular groups, already present at the sites and part of the power structure, out-competed other groups. The surviving ritual areas and groups associated with them transformed to meet the changing needs of the settlements; this included making the structures more accessible to visit and to make votive donations, as well as changing the decorations which formerly focused on the power and lifestyle of the elites, to emphasise mythical and purely ornamental motifs. The emergence of votive deposits, I believe, is related to the increasing range of individuals able to compete socially in the ritual and political areas. Labelling this as isonomy suggests that it is an equalising process, whereas it actually seems to reflect the increasing number of individuals accumulating wealth, but also the increasing arena in which individuals could stress inequality amongst themselves, while simultaneously gaining favour with the gods. The political atmosphere had changed, as Torelli suggests, which I would relate to the centralisation of power into fewer areas at the settlements, a decreased presence of endemic warfare and an increase in the number of individuals able to accumulate wealth.

Torelli assumes that, for the most part, a uniform overlapping change of political and ritual power existed at the settlements during the sixth century. The differences in the iconography at the settlements and the messages associated with the ritual structures, the varying amounts of success the structures had, as well as the differing combinations of symbols as grave goods, indicate that different relationships between political and ritual authority existed at different sites.

Cornell also holds strong views regarding the social developments of Archaic Etruria. Many of his ideas are based on the development of Rome, and its eventual domination across Etruria and the rest of Italy. His methodology is largely problematic. Cornell uses archaeological findings to fill in the gaps left by the classical literature, in an effort to prove that kingship ended in Rome at the end of the sixth century, and much later in Etruria, which resulted in the success of the former and the demise of the latter. The literature written by Greek and Roman sources, centuries after the events they describe are, of course, not an objective source to rely on. The occasional use of

archaeological data to confirm the picture drawn with the classical literature presents only one part of the story. For instance, the pottery sherd with the inscription of *rex* found in the *regia*, that Cornell discusses (1995: 94), does not necessarily mean that a *rex* resided at the building. And if it did, the real question to ask is – what exactly does the title ‘*rex*’ entail? Similarities or differences in titles held by elites across central Italy do not mean that the statuses and duties associated with these titles were also the same. The specific examples of each title must be examined within its own context.

Cornell also relies on cultural diffusionism, suggesting that political events in Greece caused similar repercussions in central Italy. Cornell states, ‘it would be reasonable to suppose, and reliable evidence confirms, that the later Roman kings were well aware of what contemporary Greek tyrants were doing, and consciously set out to imitate them’ (Cornell 1995: 145). Accordingly, Cornell also suggests that late sixth century Rome was characterized by tyrannical rule just as in Greece because, ‘they [the kings of Rome] were the product of similar historical circumstances, and reacted to them in the same way—but it was also because Rome (and other city-states in central Italy) had close and direct contacts with the Greek world at this time’ (Cornell 1995: 145). The strong contacts between the two parts of the Mediterranean world are undeniable, and they surely did exchange information. Stating that similar historical circumstances and the same reactions to them existed in both areas, however, is a complete misrepresentation of the complex situations at each settlement involved. These bold statements cannot be based solely on conjecture, but instead must include investigating the specific archaeological contexts at these places, and not assume there was uniformity for the Archaic period across the Mediterranean, brought on by intentional imitation on the part of the leaders in Italy. The term ‘tyrant’ is appropriate in Greek contexts where the case has been established and confirmed; it is misapplied when used in Italian contexts, however.

The character of the authority present at Rome and Etruscan settlements cannot be described in the same way as Greek settlements because the contexts are different, in contrast to Cornell’s views. As part of my project, the elite iconography and assemblages at many of the settlements were examined, and what emerged was a

picture of authority based on a combination of statuses that do not conform to a potential tyrant ideal. Instead Etruscan settlements should be viewed as complex entities characterised by different types of social hierarchies with varying authoritative statuses, with connections to, but independent of, the political events in Greece.

It is implied by Cornell that the development of tyranny in Rome during the reign of Etruscan kings is also related to the existence of aristocratic warlords in the Etruscan political system. Cornell argues that aristocratic warlords ruled Etruscan settlements with the use of independent armies, from at least the middle of the sixth to the early fifth century BC. The warlords, he states, competed against each other, and ruled either by force or persuasion (Cornell 1995: 144). The armies, on the other hand, were not formally or permanently attached to a settlement or region. This idea does seem to have some amount of potential. My view is that the frieze plaques from many of the ritual structures, with scenes including military themes, as well as the destruction of many of these structures, and grave good assemblages with an emphasis on weaponry, suggest that this period was characterised by endemic warfare during much of the Archaic period at many of the sites. A direct connection between a leader and an independent army during the early to middle sixth century BC, however, is impossible to substantiate. In contrast to Cornell's suggestion of the leaders of 'city-states' maintaining their own army, the presence of multiple ritual structures at some of the sites, the majority of which were destroyed, indicates that there were multiple leaders or centres of leadership at many of the settlements. The Archaic period seems to have been characterised by intra-site *and* inter-site competition and warfare. Cornell, however, does not acknowledge this level of complexity within the settlements.

All three scholars discussed above rely on classical literature, the influence of the Greek world and specific archaeological findings from separate sites to explain the development of Etruscan societies across the entire region for several centuries. As already mentioned, the classical literature was written by non-Etruscans during later periods, making it a problematic source. The writers have their own agendas, often to prove the superiority of Rome, in some cases based on misinformation, and for the

most part, not primarily intended to be enlightening about Etruscan society. It must be acknowledged that the Greek world is separate, and that the exchange of ideas and goods with central Italy did not result in the reproduction of Greek society in Etruria. The political and ritual developments formed gradually in relation to the specific contexts at each settlement, many aspects of which were shared across Etruria, but not as a direct imitation of the circumstances elsewhere. The possibility of similar situations occurring in Etruscan settlements and at Rome or the Greek world, do not necessitate similar outcomes. The unique character of each Etruscan settlement must be acknowledged. Applying archaeological evidence from one particular site to all Etruscan sites, particularly for the Orientalising and Archaic periods, misrepresents the degree of uniformity present. It is precisely through investigating the differences between the different settlements and necropoleis that social developments can be better understood.

B. ALTERNATIVE INTERPRETATIONS

Societies across central Italy, particularly Etruria, changed dramatically during the late eighth and early seventh centuries BC. These changes are directly related to the development of authoritative statuses. Prior to this, special statuses of individuals could not easily be discerned from largely egalitarian funerary practices and ephemeral settlement evidence. The social changes manifested themselves in many ways, primarily through the increased visibility of settlement and funerary architecture. Many settlements were created on the raised plateaux across Etruria. These, however, were initially separate clusters at sites, such as Veii, where the entire plateau has been properly surveyed. The distinct scatters of settlement evidence indicate that familial lines were still the main organisational criterion, which allowed for loose ties with the other familial groups sharing the same plateau, or distinct area. This may be a common phenomenon within central Italy, with these types of settlement clusters seen in Latium, at Crustumerium, Fidenae, Osteria dell'Osa and Rome, believed to indicate the continued importance of gentilitial groups, and elements of competition in the organisation of the societies (Smith 1996: 53, 61, 82; Bietti Sestieri 1992: 203, 209, 219-220). The evidence in Etruria suggests, however, that this system endured, to some degree, into the sixth century.

At the same time, funerary practices were decidedly altered. Burials went from being small *pozzi* consisting of a biconical urn holding a cremation with a small number of grave goods such as fibulae and razors, to including grand tumuli with chambers built into the bedrock to hold inhumations with grave goods from across the Mediterranean, including vases, bronze goods of weaponry and ornamental nature. The expenditure of time, labour and expense increased enormously. The spatial relationships between necropolis areas probably reflect the social relationships of the communities living in close proximity on the plateaux, similar to the spatial dynamics shown in Latium, particularly Rome and Osteria dell'Osa (Smith 1996: 53; Bietti Sestieri 1992: 200, 210). The maintenance of separate burial areas, such as at Caere, Tarquinia and Veii, particularly during their earliest phases, indicates a lack of unity, and a degree of group competition in the settlement areas. The development of one main necropolis for the majority of burials, particularly at Caere and Tarquinia during the sixth century, demonstrates the coalescing of the communities in both the funerary and settlement spheres.

The ritual sphere also changed radically. Sacred spaces in nature became monumentalised areas with large structures, many of which are referred to as 'monumental complexes'. These structures combined ritual, political and domestic functions, and demonstrated the organisation of concentrated labour to construct, decorate and maintain them. These structures represent more than the ritual sphere, as I have referred to them in order to differentiate between the funerary and settlement contexts. They represent a short-lived overlapping of ritual, political and domestic practices, controlled by a small number of elite individuals. They are partly political because they are the result of the control over labour and wealth, as well as representing restricted access to the ritual, workshop, domestic and meeting areas, and the individuals associated with the structures. Many of the structures are also partly domestic, as indicated by the banqueting equipment, animal remains and the large size of the structures.

A repertoire of iconography developed during the seventh and sixth centuries BC, by and for the elites, and was used in different forms and combinations in multiple

contexts across Etruria. The iconography was utilised to demonstrate and communicate the types and nature of authority held by individuals of the developing elite class. Many of the same iconographic symbols were used at several sites indicating that the symbols were based on shared ideas related to types of authority, across the region, which survived to some degree for many centuries. The most powerful examples of the sharing of iconographic symbols are the exchange of exact duplicates of decorative architectural terracottas, which depict the social hierarchy at work, for the adornment of ritual structures, many of which also had political and domestic purposes. The networks of architectural terracottas shared between the ritual complexes illustrate strong alliances between the elites controlling the structures within sites in some cases, as well as across regions. Likewise, in the other cases the lack of shared architectural decorations on the multiple ritual structures within the same site suggests a lack of integration, or even a degree of competition and rivalry between them. The most widely distributed architectural terracottas were the frieze plaque series found in Veii, Tarquinia, Rome and Velletri. They are believed to have been produced in Veii, perhaps in association with the Portonaccio temple, and then distributed to other structures at Veii, as well as to the neighbouring rival Tarquinia, and into Latium. The aim would have been to build bridges near and far from home to create political connections based in the ritual sphere.

The iconography used in the ritual/political sphere, which echoed the character of finds in the funerary sphere, displayed the nature of authority through the use of themes, including warrior/competition, elite private life, social representation and mythological elements. These were used in differing quantities and combinations dependent on the messages the elites wished to express. These themes offered a means of depicting elites, particularly those with authoritative statuses, conducting activities related to their statuses, such as for political assemblies or processing to battle. Mythological elements such as figures with god-like qualities or winged horses elevated the nature of the scenes to an even higher degree.

Many of the ritual/political structures and tombs relied heavily on expressing statuses related to Special Skills and Valour through the use of the *lituus*, axe and other weapons, respectively. The statuses were sometimes found together, such as Tomb A

at Casale Marittimo and the monumental complex at Murlo. The luxury of the elite lifestyle was also a predominant feature of the iconography, through the use of the chariot and banqueting equipment. Numerous tumuli contained both chariot parts and banqueting equipment, and seven of the fourteen ritual/political complexes with figured frieze plaques contained both chariot and banqueting scenes. This cross-over of iconography displayed in image form on the ritual structures and in object form as grave goods illustrates how comprehensively it permeated Etruscan society.

1. THE USE OF ICONOGRAPHY AND THE DEPICTION OF AUTHORITY AT EACH SITE

The iconography on the ritual structures, as well as the form of the ritual structures, relate to the type of authority present at each structure. The symbols inherent in the architectural terracottas, particularly the figured frieze plaques, allowed the elites to communicate aspects of their life and duties to visitors of the ritual structures, both elites and non-elites from the same settlement and other settlements. In many cases evidence of activities from within the structures has also helped identify the functions.

The iconography at **Acquarossa** is really only clear at the ritual/political complex. The figured frieze plaques showed an emphasis on social representation and mythological figures, with an added element of a warrior theme in the procession scenes. The use of Heracles in the procession scenes seems to emphasise a mythological and ritual nature; the male figure holding a staff halts the procession of mythological and human figures, with authority that must be ritual in nature. Social representation and the luxury of elite private life are depicted in the banqueting scene. The unique dancing scene probably relates to a sacred ritual involving drinking. These themes are paralleled with the structure itself showing an emphasis on ritual activities with a three *cellae* area and at least two possible altar structures, as well as banqueting, with a room that seems to be a banquet room, discovered with banqueting equipment. The iconography here focuses on ritual activities, as well as aristocratic life. The nature of authority at Acquarossa was probably largely dependent on Special Skills related to ritual activities and knowledge.

At **Murlo**, the iconography emphasised the luxury of elite life and social representation with the procession, banqueting and assembly scenes. The horse racing scene showed elements of competition, as well as social representation. The assembly scene clearly depicts authoritative figures demarcated by their use of symbols. The figure holding the *lituus* and associated with the sword and spear suggests a combination of ritual and warrior statuses; the figure holding the double axe suggests a warrior-like status has begun transforming to that of a more ceremonial nature. The divine-like qualities of the positioning of the figures and their symbols is a clear illustration of authority by association, with the elites purposely emulating divine qualities to justify their authority. The structure itself shows evidence of many functions, including ritual, with the three *cellae* area and altar feature, a banqueting area with the appropriate equipment, workshop areas and a possible meeting hall area and residence area, all within a huge structure with limited access. The nature of authority seems to have been divided amongst different statuses which may have combined Special Skills related to ritual activities and Valour which has become more ceremonial in duties.

The ritual structures at **Caere** may not have been as involved in depicting iconography related to authoritative statuses as at other sites. The ritual structures did not take part in a frieze plaque network, indeed only one of the five associated with Caere seems to have had any figured frieze plaques at all. Vigna Parocchiale contained frieze plaques emphasising warrior and competition themes with a procession scene and warriors on horseback scene. It also had an abundance of painted plaques, many of which also emphasised warrior themes. This suggests that this structure was directly associated with individuals who held Valorous authority. The structure itself seemed to combine ritual, banqueting and domestic functions, due to the *bucchero* fragment with the inscription to '*calatur*', cooking and banqueting equipment and animal bones. Vigna Parocchiale may have also been a more independent area not related to the architectural terracotta networks, or may have had different types of connections elsewhere. One bronze *lituus* came from a tomb at Caere, although the specific context is unknown, as well as three chariots and

numerous tumuli filled with exotic goods, including banqueting equipment. The nature of authority for Caere during the seventh and sixth centuries is unclear. Vigna Parocchiale may represent the main authoritative centre for the settlement during most of this period, which seems to present an emphasis on warrior and banqueting themes, so there may have been a largely valorous nature of authority at Caere.

Tarquinius had four ritual structures, all with figured frieze plaques. **The Civita Complex** had an abundance of frieze plaques, including the VRV banqueting scene, the Acquarossa-Tuscania left procession scene and three other types of procession scenes. The structure was large, imposing and probably had restricted access to both of its halves divided by a path. The votive deposits indicate a strong emphasis on banqueting, ritual and warrior activities. The burials from previous periods also make this area unique. There is a strong emphasis on warrior activities with four procession scenes and weapons deposited as votive offerings, as well as elite private life with a banqueting scene and equipment and mythological elements with the inclusion of Heracles in one of the plaques. Many different themes are covered here, but the emphasis on warrior elements suggests that the individuals associated with the Civita Complex held valorous authority.

It is difficult to assess the iconography at **Santuario**. It had a VRV procession, but the specific scene has not been published. Santuario at least expressed elements of social representation and mythology, if not a warrior element as well (in the case of the left procession). The form of the structure is also unclear.

The **Central Structure** had VRV left procession and banqueting scenes, emphasising themes of social representation and elite private life, and to a lesser degree, warrior and mythological elements. There was also another scene with a warrior walking, and a group of steers in another. The structure was large and may have been characterised by restricted access. Like the Civita Complex there was an emphasis on warrior and banqueting activities; however, there is not a lot of evidence regarding the activities held in the structure.

Ara della Regina contained a large number of frieze plaque scenes, including both of the VRV procession scenes and the banqueting scene, as well as a unique battle scene and another procession scene. Because of this, there is an emphasis on social representation, elite private life and warrior themes, and to a smaller degree mythological elements. Social representation and warrior themes dominate across Tarquinia. The form of the Ara della Regina structure, during this period, unfortunately is unknown.

All of the ritual structures at Tarquinia show a strong alliance with Veii, by also sharing the VRV frieze plaques. It is also worth noting that the Civita Complex is the only ritual structure found with frieze plaques from both the VRV and Aquarossa-Tuscania series. This suggests that the Civita Complex was firmly situated in exchange networks between elites. It is difficult to summarise the burial evidence at Tarquinia. Ten of the tombs contained chariots, and numerous others contained exotic goods including banqueting equipment and weapons.

Veii also had four ritual structures during this period, and all with figured frieze plaques. **Piazza d'Armi** shows an emphasis on warrior and social representation themes because of its procession and warrior scenes. It is interesting to note, however, that it was the only ritual structure at Veii to not have any of the VRV plaques. This indicates that this structure was not integrated with the others and retained a strong degree of independence, which may explain why it outlasted many of the other ritual structures at Veii. The Piazza d'Armi *oikos* structure was relatively small, and was located on the slightly isolated extension of the plateau. The iconography and location indicate that valorous authority might have been at work here, possibly in relation to the need for defence.

The **Campetti** structure shows an emphasis on warrior and social representation themes with two procession scenes (one from the VRV series), another with warriors on horseback and chariot racing (both from the VRV series). The ceramics and animal bones also suggest domestic and banqueting functions for the structure.

Despite a variety of iconographic elements, the visual emphasis was on that of warrior activities. The authority behind this structure was probably of a valorous nature.

Comunità apparently only had the VRV right procession, which emphasises social representation with an element of mythology. The forms and functions of the structure, however, are not well understood.

Portonaccio contained all of the VRV series plaques, which show several themes, emphasising social representation and the elite private life, with more minor emphases on mythological and warrior elements. The *oikos* structure of this particular phase is believed to have had domestic and cultic functions; the nearby votive deposit and sacellum were also foci of sacred activities. The visual iconography was very well-rounded, but given the functions and activities of the area, the authority behind Portonaccio was probably based on special skills related to ritual activities.

Again, it is difficult to summarise the funerary evidence for all of Veii. There are nearly thirty tombs with chariots, and many of course contain exotic goods, there is, however, a noticeable amount of weaponry present. It is possible that valorous authority was crucial to Veii during this period, as reflected in the architectural terracottas and grave goods. This is also supported by the construction of defensive ramparts and walls during the sixth century.

Two types of figured frieze plaque scenes dominated the region: they are the procession and the banqueting scenes. In particular, the VRV processions, of which the left procession type was found more often, occur at the majority of ritual structures with frieze plaques. The procession scenes may indicate that the region was characterised by endemic warfare during this period, and that the social order at each settlement was in need of structuring. The plaques then symbolise the ability to defend one's own ritual structure or attack another (even within the same site area), with the added help of mythological figures. They also present a social hierarchy of elites in chariots with warriors on foot, clearly demonstrating social hierarchy, including the protected/protective ruler. The sharing of the same plaques, with

connotations of warring and social order, shows an alliance between the structures and the individuals in control. Banqueting scenes, on the other hand, may indicate a group of individuals' involvement in exchange, particularly with the East. The plaques then symbolise a wealthy, elite lifestyle with specialised knowledge related to foreign practices, such as *symposia*. The two found together, as was often the case, show an interesting juxtaposition of valorous and luxurious images. In contrast, ritual structures without frieze plaques were most likely using iconography through different means, which may not be as archaeologically visible as the figured frieze plaques.

2. THE CO-DEVELOPMENT OF THE SETTLEMENTS AND THE RITUAL STRUCTURES

The landscape approaches that have acknowledged the equal importance of viewing the development of the settlements and ritual structures together have focused on ordering the landscape. Much work has been related to structuring settlement and surrounding territory into concentric rings of ritual space (Colonna 1985; Edlund 1987; Riva and Stoddart 1996). These types of areas are defined in relation to proximity to the urban centre, in an effort to define the function and nature of the ritual structures held within. My project, however, avoided the premature use of the term 'urban' to prevent misrepresenting the development of the settlements. Instead, by incorporating the numerous overlooked ritual structures located on the settlement plateaux, along with the well-known 'temples' and distant 'rural' ritual structures, a very different picture of the development of ritual space formed. By focusing on the chronological aspect of the construction of ritual structures at each site, it was possible to view contemporary developments in the ritual structures within settlements and across the region. Because of this, the functions of the structures and the circumstances surrounding the existence of the ritual structures became more apparent. In what is often referred to as the 'urban' centre, or the pre-urban settlement area here, it has been shown that many sites contained multiple ritual structures simultaneously. These areas had previously been treated as uniform entities that should be discussed in reference to their surrounding areas. It is clear now,

however, that situations within the settlement centres were much more complex than previously acknowledged. The social dynamics became more apparent by considering the form, iconography and functions of the structures. These elements are linked, directly or indirectly, to the survival of the ritual structures and the authoritative statuses associated with them.

The ritual structures were the only monumentalised areas of the developing settlements during this period. They were the physical and political foci of each settlement, and, in many cases, where authoritative individuals resided, or at least carried out many activities, including ritual activities. The destruction of many of these structures poses interesting questions as to the dramatic social changes that accompanied the development of the settlements.

All of the settlements characterised by one main ritual structure each, Acquarossa, Murlo and Castelnuovo Berardenga, were destroyed. Also, all three of these were 'monumental' or ritual/political complexes, with restricted access and no votive deposits. Murlo and Castelnuovo Berardenga, however, are among the least understood in terms of necropoleis and settlements. Acquarossa, Murlo and Castelnuovo Berardenga were destroyed in the early to late sixth century. The abandonment of these areas is curious, however. It is unclear why these areas ceased to exist at even a low-level, even if the structures were not re-built. There is not enough settlement evidence to discuss Castellina del Marangone, Tuscania and Punta della Vipera in the same way, until more excavation has been done.

Other settlements, including Caere, Tarquinia and Veii, had multiple ritual structures during the seventh and sixth centuries. These illustrate the disparate nature of the settlements during their initial development. Many of these ritual structures were destroyed or restructured, leaving fewer ritual structures at each of the sites by the end of the sixth century. At Caere, Sant' Antonio and Montetosto are the ritual structures that survived longer than the others in their late Archaic forms. Vigna Parocchiale at Caere demonstrates the clearest and most radical transformation of ritual space during this period. The 'monumental complex' was torn down and replaced with a Vitruvian Tuscan-style temple and a large open, oval structure possibly for large group

meetings, constructed around an open *piazza*. At Tarquinia, Ara della Regina and Gravisca survived the longest. Two of the ritual structures at Veii survived after the destruction of the others. They are Piazza d'Armi and Portonaccio. It is interesting that all three sites have two ritual structures with roots in the Archaic period that survive. Caere and Tarquinia both have one main ritual structure within the settlement centre, and one in an extra-urban, port location at a great distance from the settlement. Veii's inland location may relate to why two ritual structures survived within the main settlement area rather than at greater distances from each other, although both Piazza d'Armi and Portonaccio are in isolated positions on small extensions of the plateau.

The destruction of ritual structures at the sites that had multiple ritual structures must have been part of the integration and centralisation processes at these sites, bringing the disparate clusters of settlement across each plateau together under the auspices of the ritual sphere. Some of the destroyed ritual structures may have been considered minor and therefore unnecessary, while others may have been strong rivals which were destroyed because of the possible threat they posed. The destruction of the ritual structures at settlements which only ever had one, is a different matter. It is impossible to say if these were internal matters caused by the types of leadership offered through the monumental complexes, or by the limited access to the ritual activities, or if these were the result of external forces with other settlements coming to destroy their rivals.

3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOTIVE DEPOSITS

The integration of votive deposits with ritual structures was one of the most crucial factors in the development of the ritual sphere and Etruscan settlements in general. None of the nine ritual (mostly ritual/political) structures which were destroyed had foundation or active votive deposits. These are: Castelnuovo Berardenga, Murlo, Acquarossa, Castellina del Marangone, Tarquinia's Central Structure and Santuario, Caere's Vigna Parocchiale and Veii's Comunità and Campetti (destroyed in that order). Almost all of these are characterised by restricted access, with limited

entryways opening onto large courtyards. The ritual activities practised at these locations were likewise probably restricted to a small number of individuals.

Of the other twelve structures that were not destroyed, seven had votive deposits. Six of the structures to survive were restructured, four of which had votive deposits (Punta della Vipera, Portonaccio, Ara della Regina and Sant' Antonio). Of the other two, Valle della Mola seems to not have had a votive deposit and Piazza d'Armi had a votive deposit in the Hellenistic period, but it is difficult to determine if the practice began earlier there. Gravisca also had a very active votive deposit. Ara del Tufo and Montetosto, however, did not have votive deposits, although this may be due to their funerary connection or the locations at great distances from the settlement centres. Two other structures went gradually out of use, and were not destroyed or restructured: Poggio Buco and the Civita Complex; they both had votive deposits.

Votive deposits extended the opportunity of making offerings to the gods to a wider number of people, that would have increased the support at the ritual structure and the leadership attached to it. Creating votive deposits, as well as restructuring the ritual structures to increase access to sacred areas and ritual activities, seems to have determined which ritual structures survived in the late Archaic period and sometimes beyond.

4. AFTERMATH OF THE LATE SIXTH CENTURY BC

The period of dramatic upheaval, in the late sixth century BC, at several Etruscan settlements was followed by a number of changes in the ritual and funerary spheres. These changes are most visible in the transformations of architectural forms.

In the ritual sphere, the architecture reflects major changes in the activities and functions of ritual structures. No longer were ritual complexes of great size viable. Ritual structures began to conform to what is now referred to as the Vitruvian Tuscan-style temple. These temples, rather than embodying the multiple functions of the complexes, often under the aegis of being an *oikos* in form, instead emphasised only

the ritual functions through their form and decorations. The decrease in size and opening up of access illustrate its oppositional nature to the complexes. There was no longer room for multiple functions within the structure itself. A façade was constructed to elaborate the entrance with steps, columns, friezes and statues. The lack of space for residential purposes, or iconography related to residing and dining, show the end of this combination of functions within the ritual structures. The decorations, instead of emphasising warrior/competition, the luxury of elite private life or social representations, focused instead on mythological themes, particularly in statuary, and ornamental motifs, including floral designs.

The precise mechanisms behind the exchange of the frieze plaques are not known. It could have been similar to the later 'gift giving' system, by creating obligations between groups (as discussed by Glinister 2003 and Colonna 1987; see Chapter V). The circumstances related to this later period of temples, and their different system of iconography, of which Heracles plays a primary role, are drastically different, however. The iconography of the frieze plaques and the form of the ritual structures from the Archaic period primarily glorify the elites, rather than deities, as is suggested for the later periods, must indicate important differences in their exchanges.

Funerary architecture also changed dramatically. The construction of large tumuli tapered off at the end of the sixth century BC, and many necropoleis at sites including Caere, Tarquinia and Veii began including small cube tombs. This new form of tomb architecture shows a decrease in expenditure, as well as an increase in number, possibly indicating an increase in the number of individuals able to have a tomb constructed. The smaller uniform size and shape also suggest a decreasing emphasis on the grandness of the tomb, as well as the individuals buried there. The cube tombs also allowed for the spatial organisation of the necropoleis by making it easier to create rows of tombs with streets running through. Expenditure on grave goods also subsided during this period, particularly with less weaponry and chariots, and an emphasis on vases. These changes suggest a less restricted means of gaining wealth and power occurred during this period, allowing more people to be buried in rock-cut tombs, and also, that the desire to aggrandise oneself was no longer deemed as

necessary, at least in the funerary sphere, and that weaponry and chariots did not play a large part in this.

This connects directly with changes in the iconography used by the elites after the end of the sixth century BC. All of the symbols investigated in this project continued to be used for several centuries, although only primarily visible in the funerary sphere. In general, these symbols began being used predominantly in image form only. *Litui*, axes and knives, chariots and fruit or flower-like ornaments were constant themes on sarcophagi and tomb paintings.

Tables 1 and 2 in Chapter VI show how the use of the *litui*, axes and knives was transformed over time. The *lituus* often appeared on sarcophagi, particularly in the Chiusi area. The scenes depict a group of elite men each holding a distinctive symbol, sometimes including more than one instance of a *lituus*, as if in a political assembly, actively looking and gesticulating at each other, often with non-elites at a lower level within the scene presenting themselves. Some of these scenes are similar to the seated assembly scene at Murlo; however, the inclusion of non-elites seems significant. These scenes purposely demonstrate the interactions between elites and non-elites, perhaps indicating a largely administrative function for the *lituus* by this point in time. The *lituus* continued also in Rome, and marked the status of the king as an augur (see Chapter III.C).

Axes and knives also began to be used in the funerary sphere in image form. Sarcophagi tomb paintings and altars depict the use of axes and knives, in the case of the altar, as part of a sacrifice scene, and on many of the sarcophagi from Volterra, as part of a mythological scene. These scenes relate more to the ritual sphere than to connotations of a warrior status. Axes and knives seem to have remained a crucial symbolic element in the ritual sphere related to ritual authority through sacrifice. The gradual development of lictors is probably part of this progression and eventual adoption in Rome, in which the lictors remained an important symbol associated with the *rex sacrorum* and later the consuls, where the use of *lictors* in a procession showed which consul was in power (see Chapter III.C).

Images of chariots on sarcophagi and *cippi*, at sites such as Volterra and Bologna, show the transformation of meanings behind their use. Earlier tombs that included actual chariots illustrate the opulence of elite life, which included transportation in life and death, as well as connections with the East. Images of chariots in the later tombs symbolised the journey after death, with the deceased pictured riding in the chariot, often led by Charon, the guide to the underworld. The chariot continued to be used in Rome, including its use by consuls and emperors during triumphal processions.

Fruit and flower-like ornaments also continued to be used as symbols related to elite Etruscan women. Their original use, as ornamental details on toiletry items or plectrums, transformed when they began being used in image form in funerary contexts. Pomegranates, in particular, were used as a common motif in sarcophagus lid decorations. The sculpted image of the deceased woman holding a pomegranate symbolised an elite status, as well as creating a connection with Persephone and Demeter, female divinities associated with the underworld.

C. DISCUSSING TERMS OF AUTHORITY FOR THE ETRUSCANS

The past approaches used in the investigation of Etruscan society, discussed in Chapter III, have often focused on a narrow viewpoint by neglecting crucial data. The works emphasising epigraphic material and classical literature are based on assumptions concerning the social hierarchy. Specific titles from Etruscan and Latin sources are argued to be well understood, presenting a clear hierarchy of royalty, magistracies and priesthoods, many of which could be held by the same individual. The titles often referred to include the Etruscan terms: *lauchme*, *zilath* and *netsvis*, as well as the Latin terms *rex*, *praetor*, *augur* and *haruspex* (see Chapter III.C). Inscriptions, mainly funerary, suggest that many different types of authoritative statuses existed for the Hellenistic period. For the Orientalising and Archaic periods, archaeological evidence suggests that a variety of authoritative statuses existed. The iconography of the frieze plaques, particularly, the ‘seated assembly’ scenes, suggest that individuals with different types of authoritative statuses were present, and functioned together, at many of the sites. Other iconographic elements from the frieze plaques, echoed in many of the grave goods, show the existence of statuses described

by the classical literature. Findings of *litui* and double axes or *fascēs* suggest the presence of augur and lictor statuses. The character of these statuses, the latter in particular, however, are associated with Roman customs that may not correspond to those of the Etruscans. It is interesting, however, that the potential Etruscan terms for 'augur' and 'lictor' have not been identified. The Etruscan inscriptions and classical literature related to Etruscan society are helpful to a certain degree. The exact duties and responsibilities associated with the titles and paraphernalia are still uncertain, however.

The traditional or classical approach relies on terms such as kings, princes and warriors, or their Italian equivalents, as many belonging to this approach are from the Italian tradition. Much of the focus lies in the potential for finding archaeological data to correlate with classical literature, to corroborate the existence of Etruscan kings, as suggested by Livy, Servius and others. 'Prince' and 'warrior' are used, often together, to describe Etruscan burial assemblages, rich in luxury goods and weaponry. These terms have a lot of modern connotations attached to them, however. 'King' and 'prince' are associated with hereditary leadership, often with a luxurious lifestyle, sometimes with secular rule, and at other times with the divine right to rule. 'Warrior' is associated with violent warfare. All three, of course, are associated with adult males. As has been seen in funerary evidence, many of the so-called 'princely' and 'warrior' burials belong to females and sub-adults. These burials often indicate the wealthy and important statuses of the deceased, many of whom were not necessarily members of a ruling class or those who had engaged in warfare. The grave goods relate to part of an iconographic system, which relies on items to express multiple messages about the deceased, many of which may not be obvious now. The apparent emphases on certain aspects, such as those of a warrior, may be skewed due to modern perceptions of the symbolism associated with objects, in this case, weaponry, which may relate more to other facets of social life. In relation to the settlement evidence, the monumental ritual complexes are often referred to as palaces or *regiae*, literally houses of kings. These should be seen, however, as integrating multiple activities, and not just as elite residences. Importantly, it has been shown that many of the sites included more than one monumental ritual complex, indicating a level of decentralisation not normally associated with kingdoms. The hierarchy of

authority within Etruscan society is more complicated than implied by terms such as king, prince and warrior.

The anthropological approaches focus on identifying social change at organisational levels. This emphasises the development of social hierarchies and rank societies from *ad hoc* leadership to achieved status and then to ascribed (inherited) status. Pre-Roman central Italy is often investigated in terms of its transition to chiefdom societies, originating during the Final Bronze Age, characterised by an increase in the visibility of settlements, with growth in population sizes, economic activities of production and exchange, as well as differentiation in burial. The transition to state societies presents another great focus, often associated with the late Archaic period, characterised by urbanised settlements with centralised authority over even larger population sizes and economic activities at a higher scale. These elements of social change that are focused on within anthropological perspectives are crucial to understanding the nature of the societies. The variety within these levels of society, both chiefdoms and states, however, is not always made clear. For instance, chiefs are seen as the head of ritual, economic and political activity within chiefdoms; however, the scenario is potentially much more complex in reality, with other individuals being highly involved in the various spheres, particularly as communities become larger. How these multiple important statuses develop is not a well-understood phenomenon.

There is no simple solution to such a fundamental and critical problem as defining the terms used to describe social change and statuses. The case studies used here have helped demonstrate how complex and variable social development at settlements can be, and how difficult it can be to describe the nature of authority developing in parallel. The various types of approaches used in investigating the Etruscans can utilise masses of data, but the limitations inherent in the frameworks keep a finer level of insight out of reach. In an attempt to acknowledge and address these issues, this project has focused on investigating the characteristics associated with the development of authoritative statuses, and the choices made by the authoritative individuals in representing themselves, as well as how the non-authoritative individuals chose to react.

The development of Etruscan settlements during the Orientalising and Archaic periods shows that there was not one linear progression towards complexity and centralisation. Different circumstances were present at each of the settlements. Some of the settlements were destroyed, and others continued to exist. Distinct choices on the part of the authoritative individuals are apparent in the form of the construction of ritual monumental architecture and the iconography associated with them (and in burials as well). On the other hand, choice is apparent also on the part of some of the authoritative individuals, as well as non-authoritative individuals in the destruction and abandonment of the ritual monumental architecture in some instances, reconstruction in other cases, or continued use of the site as a votive deposit. All of the choices involved in the maintenance, destruction or transformation of ritual sites show varying acts of cooperation and opposition between individuals and groups of individuals. These levels of action must be acknowledged as being a critical means of examining the development of social hierarchy. The destruction and reconstruction of ritual sites illustrate major changes in separating out the activities and authoritative statuses associated architecturally with the ritual sphere, as well as major changes in ritual practices by changing the architectural form of the ritual structures to increase access, and create formal votive deposits. The presence of different types of authority shows unique circumstances at each site over time. Strong connections between many of the settlements, or rather authoritative individuals at separate settlements, were shown by the shared means of expressing their authority through shared iconography.

As an aside, the interaction related to iconographic systems, monumental architecture, exchange and possibly warfare between the Etruscan settlements harkens back to the discussion of Peer Polity Interaction. There was certainly enough activity within Etruria to stimulate high levels of competition. How the nature of the developing authoritative statuses was affected is another matter. The monumental complexes and the associated iconography reflect emphases on ritual, valorous and luxurious activities for the authoritative elites, during the seventh and sixth centuries BC. The destruction of the structures and their iconography then mark a new dynamic that

upset the previous network of contacts between the settlements, and created a new one.

During the Orientalising and Archaic periods authority based on Special Skills involved in ritual practices, and Valour involved in acts of strength were of primary importance. The presence of special skills is seen in the creation of monumental ritual architecture, and findings of *litui* in burial and votive deposit contexts, as well as their images on the ritual structures. The presence of valour is evident in creation of walls at some settlements, the destruction and restructuring of monumental ritual complexes, findings of weapons, particularly axes and knives, both ceremonial and functional in burials, votive deposits and imagery on the ritual structures. The roles may have been combined by authoritative individuals in a variety of ways. During this period, it is possible to view this combination of authoritative statuses as a 'chiefly' type existence, although this sounds misleading. The degree of variability in the types of authority present between the settlements means that there is not one obvious term that suffices in describing all of them. The transformations in the nature of the authoritative statuses during this period did not occur uniformly across the region.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

A. BRIEF SUMMARY

Much work on central Italy, and Etruria in particular, has focused on the sixth century and rightly so: this was a period of dramatic change. However, previous works have often focused on certain aspects, at the cost of neglecting others. Reliance upon classical literature is problematic, as already discussed: viewing developments in the Greek world as necessary precursors to developments in central Italy is inappropriate, and archaeological evidence needs to be better defined as data related to specific settlements for a specific time period. By investigating the archaeological evidence at several Etruscan sites as separate but related entities, through the multiple contexts of ritual, settlement and funerary development, the meanings behind the dramatic changes of this period have become clearer.

I would like to review the expectations of this project as discussed in the first three chapters (particularly Chapter 1.D). It was asserted that choice at both individual and group levels of society can be investigated, and is crucial to understanding the development of authoritative statuses. In particular, authority related to special skills and valour was suggested as being especially salient due to the nature of the data, and the nature of this period. The development of these forms of authority can only fully be viewed through a multi-contextual approach, which also examines the creation of iconography shared between the contexts. The ritual context in particular, was very revealing. As stated, the development of authoritative statuses and the settlements themselves could be better seen through an intra-site chronologically-focused, rather than just a spatially-focused, perspective of the changes in ritual space. These points will be discussed below.

The many changes in a number of social spheres for the Etruscans illustrate choice and action by both individuals and groups. To some extent the actions of individuals are easier to see in the elite contexts of monumental architecture and funerary assemblages, which not coincidentally have been the focus of much archaeological

work. The iconography of the elites clearly depicts how these individuals and groups were representing their authoritative statuses. The degree of choice in the actions of non-elites, however, is often neglected. The decisions involved in the non-elite acceptance or refusal of the authoritative elites had serious consequences; it is not merely the reaction of non-elites to elites, it is a dialogue of actions each affecting the other. The very acts of construction, destruction, maintenance or transformation of ritual structures very clearly illustrate different instances of cooperation or opposition for both elites and non-elites. In particular, the re-use of a destroyed ritual structure as a votive deposit demonstrates the result of oppositional choices of different groups and individuals in their attitudes towards the ritual space. Funerary practices, as well, show varying degrees of agreement between individuals and groups in the choices involved in the location, form, etc. of burials.

The archaeological evidence demonstrates that major changes occurred in the sixth century BC in the ritual, settlement and funerary spheres, as well as in the iconography used in all of them. Many of these changes illustrate the development and transformations of social hierarchies with different types of authority present at the various sites (also evident in more than one sphere). Unfortunately, only five of the sites included an ample amount of iconography that could be compared with the findings in the ritual and funerary contexts. The two elements of Special Skills and Valour that provided the focus of this study did prove to be crucial forms of authority during this period for the Etruscans. The available data, which was primarily connected with the ritual and funerary spheres, indicated that both forms of authority were present at many of the sites in Etruria. Findings from Acquarossa suggest that authority was based largely on Special Skills, while findings at Murlo suggest that a combination of Special Skills and Valour was used by the authoritative individuals. Caere, Tarquinia and Veii all showed a predominance of valorous authority in the iconography and archaeological evidence. Although this body of evidence cannot produce powerful statistics, it is possible to suggest that authority based on valour was a common and successful means during most of the sixth century BC, especially at Caere, Tarquinia and Veii, whose survival past the sixth century BC is probably not coincidental. The representation and nature of authority seem to have changed, however, marked by the destruction and restructuring of ritual structures and their

iconography, particularly that of the figured frieze plaques, at the same three settlements at the end of the sixth century, probably enabling their survival past this period.

The late sixth/early fifth century signals the end of this phase, characterised by monumental, ritual complexes and rich tombs, with iconography linking the two together with scenes of elite life, including the representation of authority. The destruction of many of the ritual structures during this period relates as much to the ritual sphere as it does to the settlement sphere. The ritual structures embodied control over ritual, political and economic activities; the destruction of many of these and the survival of only a few, transformed the settlements from distinct but interrelated areas of habitation, each with their own ritual and authoritative centres, into more cohesive, centralised entities with fewer ritual and authoritative centres, that were now separated out physically in the architecture. The change in form of ritual structures from monumental complexes to temples, as well as the introduction of formal votive deposits at some of them, indicate the changing activities associated with the ritual sphere. From this point on ritual activities were meant to be held at structures whose form emphasised ritual to the exclusion of other activities, and that this was characterised by wider access to the structure, physically and for worship through the votive deposits.

The change in tomb architecture, from large tumuli to small, uniform cube tombs, shows restraint, as well as an end to the need for aggrandising individuals through funerary practices, and a wider group of individuals able to afford and deserve a tomb of significant size. Grave good assemblages also suggest less desire or need to include as many goods as previously, with less emphasis on physical objects and the inclusion of more imagery of the same symbols. This continuity of the use of many of the same symbols into the fifth century shows their continued importance; however, the transformation from object form to image illustrates the changing use of these symbols, i.e. valorous authority based on warrior activities represented through the use of weaponry during the early sixth century, to valorous authority based on ceremonial activities through the use of images, ceramic reproductions, and non-functional weapons.

The sixth century BC saw the creation of authoritative statuses for Etruscan societies. These statuses grew from leadership at the family or corporate group level, with additional duties related to ritual and warrior activities, in many cases. Authority and power in these areas were manifested through the construction of monumental architecture to house the ritual, political, residential and other needs of the elite individuals. Their limited access, and internal placement of iconography extolling the virtues of elite, authoritative life indicate that these structures were intended primarily for the elites who resided there, and other elites visiting from elsewhere. The destruction or restructuring of almost all of these monumental ritual complexes, with the exception of Montetosto, show the dramatic end of this period when these types of authority in combination with these structures were no longer viable. The decrease in size of the multi-purpose complexes to small temples that do not leave room for purposes other than ritual to occur within the walls, demonstrates the separation of ritual, political and residential functions.

The iconography and archaeological remains from the ritual structures and funerary contexts illustrate the creation of a repertoire of iconography related to representation of authority, which was shared by many of the sites. The iconographic symbols expressing different authoritative statuses were used in different combinations at the various sites. The sharing of exact copies of figured frieze plaques, however, shows that many iconographic scenes were deemed appropriate at several sites without alteration because the iconographic repertoire had become fixed to some degree. Sharing the same frieze plaques also indicates the creation of alliances between them.

The construction of multiple ritual structures at many of the Etruscan sites and the exchange of frieze plaques and other architectural decorations shows very clearly that this was a period of competition between the authoritative individuals and their respective structures. The destruction and redecoration of these structures are the result of unsuccessful leadership and/or the end of an alliance between the structures sharing architectural decorations or space within the same plateau. The restructuring and redecoration of the structures without the use of figured frieze plaques depicting elites then mark the end of this highly competitive period, which characterised itself

in a different way. The settlements that survived then became more centralised with less need for the authoritative individuals to legitimise their statuses through iconography within restrictive monumental architecture and grand tombs.

B. WIDER PERSPECTIVES

This study has developed an approach to examine the development of authoritative statuses, in particular for the Etruscans during the Orientalising and Archaic periods. The aim has been to illustrate the complexities involved, and the importance of the ritual sphere during this period, the results of which have been discussed in the previous chapter. The contributions of the methodology of this project are twofold. The multi-contextual approach combined a variety of types of evidence, for the first time, in order to observe how changes in one sphere of society affect the others. Second, iconography was integrated, not just as part of material culture studies, but as an inseparable element of social development. Salient to this is the idea that iconography consists of more than just objects and images, but also includes a whole range of archaeologically recoverable things, such as structures, defensive features and votive deposits, which reflect meaningful social decisions, rather than just acts of construction. Etruscan iconography is often part of positivist approaches used to identify mythological figures and styles of craftsmanship, based on Greek parallels and classical literature. In contrast, the results here demonstrate that the significance of the iconography is not so simple; it contains levels of reference, which relate directly to social development, and not just decorative motifs.

In relation to future examinations of authority for the Etruscans, there are important avenues to pursue. The ‘temples’ from the late Archaic period on, were constructed to emphasise their ritual function, although they probably also held connections to political and trade activities (particularly the emporia). This, however, still leaves a gap in the archaeological record of locating the new political and residential structures of the authoritative individuals during the late Archaic period. The transformation of the Vigna Parrocchiale area at Caere may represent a clear picture of how the

upheaval of authority was embodied architecturally. The temple and circular structure positioned around an open courtyard probably illustrate the development of public space, incorporating separate monumental structures, one for ritual purposes, and the other for political purposes. To better understand how altered forms of authority were made manifest in the fifth century BC, other potential structures related to ritual and non-ritual authority must be looked for in the archaeological record.

More generally, this has also been an attempt to remove Etruscan archaeology from its isolated position in the discipline. The Etruscans are often viewed as a derivative culture, secondary to the Greeks and Romans, or as mysterious, and therefore lie outside the norms of general archaeological discussions of theory. My thesis shows that it is possible to look at the complexity of the Etruscans just as any other culture could be examined. It is my hope that future studies will be able to draw on more and better data, as surveys and excavations continue, thereby, as this study has attempted to do, placing Etruscan studies into mainstream archaeological debates.

GLOSSARY

aes rude	amorphous masses of metal, which served as early currency
arx	citadel
lagobolon	(Greek) a curved staff associated with divining and hunting rabbits
oikos	house or household
peripteral	temple surrounded by an external colonnade
prodigium	portent
sphinges	plural for sphinx

Bibliography

- Åkerstrom, Å. 1954 "Untersuchungen über die figürlichen Terrakottafrise aus Etrurien und Latium", *OpRom* 1 (191-223).
- Ampolo, C. 1976-1977 "Demarato. Osservazioni sulla mobilità sociale arcaica", *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 9-10 (333-345).
- Andrén, A. 1940 *Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples* (2 vols). Lund: Gleerup.
- 1967 "Il santuario della necropoli di Cannicella ad Orvieto", *StEtr* 35 (41-85).
- 1971 "Osservazioni sulle terracotta architettoniche etrusco: italiche", *OpRom* 8 (1-16).
- 'Architettura' 1986 *Architettura etrusca nel Viterbese: ricerche svedesi a San Giovenale e Acquarossa 1956-1986*. Ed: C. Nylander. Rome: DeLuca.
- Barker, G; T. Rasmussen 1998 *The Etruscans*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barrett, J. C. 1994 *Fragments from Antiquity: An Archaeology of Social Life in Britain, 2900 - 1200 BC*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Bartoloni, G. 1972 *Le tombe da Poggio Buco nel Museo Archeologico di Firenze*, Florence: Olschki .
- 1992 "Palazzo o tempio? A proposito dell' edificio arcaico di Poggio Buco", *Archeologia e Storia Antica* 14 (9-31).
- 2000 "La tomba" in *Principi Etruschi tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*. Bologna: Marsilio (164-171).
- 2001a "Le necropoli" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*, Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider (89).
- 2001b "Piazza d'Armi" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*, Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider (29-35).
- Bartoloni, G; A. Babbi; V. Olivieri; A. Palmieri 2001 "Isola Farnese" in *Veio*,

Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto, Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini.
Rome: "L'Erma" Bretschneider (5).

Bartoloni, G; A. Berardinetti; L. Drago; A. De Santis 1994 "Veio tra IX e VI secolo a.C.", *ArchCl* 46 (1-46).

Blanck, H; S. Steingräber 1982 *Miscellanea Archaeologica Tobias Dohrn Dedicata*.
Rome: G. Bretschneider

Beazley, J.D. 1956 *Attic Black-Figure Vase Painters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Belelli Marchesini, B. 2001 "Comunità" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a Confronto*. (Ed) A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" Bretschneider (23-28).

Benelli, E. 1994 *Le iscrizioni bilingue etrusco-latine*. Florence: Olschki.

Berardinetti, A. 1994 "Veio tra IX e VI secolo a.C. Primi risultati sull'analisi comparata delle necropoli veienti", *ArchCl* 47 (5-15).

Bergquist, B. 1973 "Was there a formal dining-room, sacred or civic, on the acropolis of Acquarossa", *OpRom* 9 (21-34).

Bietti Sestieri, A.M. 1981 "Produzione e scambio nell'Italia protostorica. Alcune ipotesi sul ruolo dell'industria metallurgica nell'Etruria mineraria alla fine dell'età del bronzo", in *L'Etruria mineraria, Atti XII Convegno di Studi Etruschi e Italici* (223-264).

1992 *The Iron Age Community of Osteria dell'Osa. A Study of Socio-political Development in Central Tyrrhenian Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bispham, E.; C. Smith 2000 (eds.) *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Blanck, H.; Steingräber, S. 1982 (eds.) *Miscellanea Archaeologica Tobias Dohrn Dedicata*. Rome: G. Bretschneider.

- Boardman, J. 1964 *The Greeks Overseas*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- 1972 "Herakles, Peisistratos and sons", *RA* 1 (57-72).
- 1975 "Herakles, Peisistratos and sons", *JHS* 95 (1-12).
- Bocci Pacini, P. 1973 "Un ritrovamento Arcaico presso Casteluovo Berardenga" *StEtr* 41 (121-141).
- 1980 "La Stipe della Fonte Veneziana ad Arezzo" *StEtr* 48 (73-91).
- Boëthius, A. 1970 *Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture*. New York: Penguin.
- Boitani, F.M. 1982 "Veio. Nuovi rinvenimenti nella necropoli di Monte Michele" in *Archeologia nella Tuscia. Atti del primo incontro di studio (Viterbo 1980)*, Eds: G. Bonucci Caporali, A.M. Moretti Sgubini (95-103).
- 1985 "Veio: La Tomba 'Principesca' della necropoli di Monte Michele" *StEtr* 51 (535-556).
- Boitani, F; M. Cataldi, M. Pasquinucci 1975 *Etruscan Cities*. London: Cassell.
- Bonfante, G. and L. Bonfante 2002 *The Etruscan Language. An Introduction* (2nd ed). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bonghi Jovino, M. 1986 (Ed) *Gli Etruschi di Tarquinia. Catalogo della mostra*, Modena: Panini.
- Bonghi Jovino, M; C. Chiaramonte Treré 1997 *Scavi Sistematici nell'Abitato. Campagne 1982-1988*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider.
- Bonucci Caporali, G; A.M. Moretti Sgubini 1982 (Eds) *Archeologia nella Tuscia. Atti del primo incontro di studio (Viterbo 1980)*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider.
- Bourdieu, P. 1967 "Postface" in *Architecture gothique et pensée scholastique*, by E. Panofsky. New York: Meridian Books (135-167).
- Boyd, R; P.J. Richerson 1985 *Culture and evolutionary process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Brogi, G. 1875 "Sopra le tombe a pozzo scavate nell' agro chiusino", *Bullettino degli Annali dell' Istituto* (216-220).
- Brown, F.E. 1974-1975 "La protostoria della regia", *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 47 (15-36).
- 1976 "Of huts and houses" in *In Memoriam O.J. Brendel*. Mainz: von Zabern (5-12).
- Brück, J. 1999 "Ritual and rationality: Some problems of interpretation in European Archaeology", *Journal of European Archaeology* 2: 1 (313-344).
- Bruni, S. 1997 "Stele" in: *Casa Buonarroti: la collezione archeologica*. (Ed) S. Corsi. Milano: Charta (38-40).
- Bruun, C. 1993 "Herakles and the Tyrants. An Archaic Frieze from Velletri" in *Deliciae Fictiles* (267-275).
- Burnett, A; U. Wartenberg; R. Witschonke 1998 *Coins of Macedonia and Rome: Essays in Honour of Charles Hersh*. London: Spink
- Butterworth, M. 1970. "Procession" in: *Poggio Civitate (Murlo, Siena): The Archaic Etruscan Sanctuary* [catalogue of the exhibit in Florence and Siena]. Florence: Olschki (58-60).
- Butterworth, M. & T. Gantz 1970. "Divine Triads" in: *Poggio Civitate (Murlo, Siena): The Archaic Etruscan Sanctuary*. Florence: Olschki (55-57).
- Canfora, L. 1998 (Ed) *Venticinque Secoli dopo l'invenzione della Democrazia*. Paestum: Fondazione Paestum.
- Cannon, A. 1989 "Historical dimensions in mortuary expressions of status and sentiment", *Current Anthropology* 30:4 (437-458).
- Cataldi, M. 1993 "Terrecotte Archaiche e tardo-Archaiche da Tarquinia" in *Deliciae Fictitiles*, Stockholm: Afström (206-219).
- Cateni, G. 1988. *Il Museo Guarnacci di Volterra*. Pisa: Milan.

- Cavalli-Sforza, L.L.; M.W. Feldman 1981 *Cultural Transmission and Evolution: a Quantitative Approach*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cavallotti Batchvarova 1967 "Settima campagna di scavo (Ott-Nov 1964)", *NotScav* (107-260).
- Chapman, R; K. Randsborg 1981. "Approaches to the archaeology of death" in *The Archaeology of Death*, Eds: R. Chapman, I. Kinnes, K. Randsborg. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Chapman, R; I. Kinnes; K. Randsborg 1981 (Eds) *The Archaeology of Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Chiaramonte Treré, C. 1999 (Ed) *Tarquinia. Scavi sistematici nell'abito. Campagne 1982-1988. I Materiali 1*. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider.
- Clemen, C. 1936 *Die Religion der Etrusker*. Bonn: L. Röhrscheid.
- Coarelli, F. 1981 *Il Foro Boario. Dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*, Rome: Quasar.
- 1983 *Il Foro Romano. Periodo arcaico*. Rome: Quasar.
- 1998 "Comitium e Comitia: l'assemblea e il voto a Roma in età repubblicana" in *Venticinque Secoli dopo l'invenzione della Democrazia*, Ed: L. Canfora. Paestum: Fondazione Paestum (133-143).
- Colini, G.A. 1908 "Intorno all'origine della civiltà della prima età del ferro in Italia", *BPI* 34 (35-39).
- 1919 "Veio- Scavi nell'area della città e della necropoli" in *NotScav* (3-12).
- Colonna, G. 1959 "Santa Severa (Roma) – Scavi e ricerche nel sito dell'antica Pyrgi (1957-1958)", *NotScav* (143-263).
- 1963 "Un nuovo santuario dell'agro ceretano", *StEtr* 31 (135-147).
- 1970 "Pyrgi" in *Nuovi Tesori dell'Antica Tuscia. Catalogo della mostra*. Viterbo: Associazione Tuscia (60-62).

1973 "Ricerche sull'Etruria interna volsiniese", *StEtr* 41 (45-72).

1985a *Santuari d'Etruria*. Milan: Electa.

1985b "Il santuario di Montetosto" in *Case e palazzi d'Etruria*, Ed: S. Stopponi. Regione Toscana: Electa (192-195).

1987 "Etruria e Lazio nell'età dei Tarquini" in *Etruria e Lazio arcaico*. Ed: M. Cristofani. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (55-66).

1999 "L'Italia antica: Italia centrale" in *Carrie da Guerra e Principi Etruschi*, Ed: A. Emiliozzi. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider (15-23).

2001 "Portonaccio" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*, Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider (37-66).

Colonna, G.; F.W. von Hase 1984 "Alle origini della statuaria etrusca: La Tomba delle Statue presso Ceri", *StEtr* 52 (13-54).

Comella, A. 2001 *Il Santuario di Punta della Vipera. Santa Marinella Comune di Civitavecchia. I materiali votivi*, Rome: G. Bretschneider.

Conkey, M.; C. Hastorf 1990 (Eds) *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, A.B. 1914 *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cornell, T.J. 1978 "Principes of Tarquinia", *JRS* 68 (167-173).

1995 *The Beginnings of Rome, Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars*. London: Routledge.

Crawford, M. 1998 "Selinus and the quadrigatus" in *Coins of Macedonia and Rome: Essays in Honour of Charles Hersh*. Eds: A. Burnett; U. Wartenberg; R. Witschonke. London: Spink (119-123).

Cristofani, M. 1975 "Considerazioni su Poggio Civitate (Murlo, Siena)", *Prospettiva* 1975:1 (9-17)

1981 "Riflessioni sulla decorazione architettonica di prima fase in Etruria e

Roma” in *Gli Etruschi e Roma. Atti dell'incontro di studio in onore di M. Pallottino* (189-198).

1983 *Gli Etruschi del mare*. Milan: Longanesi.

1985 (Ed) *Civiltà degli Etruschi*. Milano: Electa.

1987a (Ed) *Etruria e Lazio arcaico*. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche.

1987b “I santuari: tradizioni decorative” in *Etruria e Lazio Arcaico*, Ed: M. Cristofani. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (95-120).

1988 “Cerveteri” in *Caere- 1. Il Parco Archeologico*, Ed: M. Cristofani; G. Nardi; M.A. Rizzo. Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche (29-41).

1989-90 “Scavi nell'area urbana di Caere: le terrecotte decorative”, *StEtr* 41 (69-84).

1990 (Ed) *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini*. Rome: ‘L’Erma’ Bretschneider.

1992 *Lo scarico arcaico della Vigna Parrocchiale, Part I*. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche.

1997 “Dove vivevano i principi etruschi”, *Archeo* 13.6 (46-54).

1999 (Ed) *Dizionario illustrato della civiltà etrusca*. Florence: Giunti.

Cristofani, M.; G. Nardi; M.A. Rizzo 1988 *Caere- 1. Il Parco Archeologico*. Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche.

D’Agostino, B. 1989 “Image and society in archaic Etruria”, *JRS* 79 (1-10).

Davis, W. 1989 *The Canonical Tradition in Ancient Egyptian Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Damgaard Andersen, H. 1993 “Archaic architectural terracottas and their relation to building identification” in *Deliciae Fictiles*. Stockholm: Afström (71-86).

1997 “The archaeological evidence for the origin and development of the Etruscan city in the 7th to 6th centuries BC” in *Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries BC*, ed: H. Damgaard Andersen, H.W. Horsnaes, S. Houby-Nielsen and A. Rathje. *Acta Hyperborea* 7 (343-382).

- Damgaard Andersen, H; H.W. Horsnaes, S. Houby-Nielsen and A. Rathje 1997 (Eds) *Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries BC Acta Hyperborea 7*.
- Delpino, F. 2000 "Regalità e potere" in *Principi Etruschi tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*. Bologna: Marsilio (223-225).
- De Marinis, G. 1996. *Alle origini di Firenze. Dalla preistoria alla città romana*, Florence: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, Soprintendenza ai Beni Archeologici per la Toscana.
- De Marrais, E; L.J. Castillo; T. Earle 1996 "Ideology, materialization, and power strategies", *Current Anthropology* 37:1 (15-31).
- De Polignac, F. 1995 *Cults, Territory and the Origins of the Greek City-state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Puma, R; J.P. Small 1994 *Murlo and the Etruscans*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dennis, G. 1883 *The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*. London: J.Murray.
- di Gennaro, F. 1982 "Organizzazione del territorio nell'Etruria meridionale protostorica: applicazione di un modello grafico", *DArch* (102-112).
- 1986 *Forme di insediamento tra Tevere e Fiora dal Bronzo Finale al principio dell'Eta del Ferro*. Florence: Olschki.
- Dobres, M.A; J. Robb 2000a "Agency in archaeology: paradigm or platitude?" in *Agency in Archaeology*, ed: M.A. Dobres, J. Robb. London: Routledge (3-17).
- Dobres, M.A; J. Robb 2000b (Eds) *Agency in Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Downey, S. 1993 "Archaic architectural terracottas from the Regia" in *Deliciae Fictiles*, Stockholm: Afström (233-248).
- Drago, L. 1994 "Veio tra IX e VIII secolo a.C. Primi risultati sull'analisi comparata delle necropoli veienti", *ArchCl* 46 (15-29).

Drennan, R; C. Uribe 1987 (Ed) *Chieftdoms in the Americas*. Boston: University Presses of America.

Ducati, P. 1923 "Una nuova stele villanoviana", *BPI* 43 (83-94).

1932 *Pontische Vasen*. Berlin: H. Keller.

Durkheim, E. 1995 *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. New York: The Free Press (K.E. Fields' translation of the original *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* from 1912).

Earle, T. 1978 *Economic and social organization of a complex chieftdom: the Halelea district, Kaua'I, Hawaii*. *Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Anthropological Papers* 63. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

1990 "Style and iconography as legitimation in complex chieftdoms" in *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*, Eds: M. Conkey and C. Hastorf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (73-81).

1991a "The evolution of chieftdoms" in *Chieftdoms, Power, Economy, and Ideology*, Ed: T. Earle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1-15).

1991b "Property rights and the evolution of chieftdoms" in *Chieftdoms, Power, Economy, and Ideology*, Ed: T. Earle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (71-99).

1991c (Ed) *Chieftdoms, Power, Economy, and Ideology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edlund, I.E.M. 1987 *The Gods and the Place*. Stockholm: Afström.

1994 "Ritual destruction of cities and sanctuaries" in *Murlo and the Etruscans*, Eds: R. De Puma and J.P. Small. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press (16-28).

Eliade, M. 1959 *The Sacred and the Profane*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Ellenius, A. 1998 *Iconography, Propaganda and Legitimation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Emiliozzi, A. 1999 *Carri da guerra e principi etruschi. Catalogo della mostra*. Rome: G. Bretschneider.

- Esposito, A.M. 2001 *Principi Guerrieri*. Milano: Electa.
- Fabricotti, E. 1980 "Fregi fittili in Magna Grecia" *AttiMGrecia* 21 (18-20).
- Falchetti, F; A. Romualdi, 2000. *Die Etrusker*. Stuttgart: Theiss.
- Falchi, I. 1898 "Vetulonia- Nuove scoperte nella necropoli", *NotScav* (141-163).
- Flannery, K.V; J. Marcus 1983 (Eds) *Cloud People: Divergent Evolution of the Zapotec and Mixtec Civilizations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fortunati, F. R. 1989 "Il tempio delle Stimmate" in *Museo Civico di Velletri*. Ed: T. Ceccarini, et al. Rome: Casa Editrice Quasar (57-88).
- 1990 "Velitrae" in *La Grande Roma dei Tarquini*. Ed: M. Cristofani. Rome: 'L'Erma' Bretschneider (199-206).
- 1993 "Il tempio delle Stimmate di Velletri: il rivestimento arcaico e considerazioni sul sistema decorativo" in *Deliciae Fictiles, AIRRS* (25-266).
- Fried, M.H. 1967 *The Evolution of Political Society, An Essay in Political Anthropology*. New York: Random House.
- Fugazzola Delpino, M.A. 1979 "The Proto-Villanovan: A Study" in *Italy Before the Romans*, ed: D. Ridgway, F.R. Ridgway. London: Academic Press (31-51).
- Fusco, U; O. Cerasuolo 2001 "Campetti" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a Confronto*. (Ed) A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" Bretschneider (9-15).
- Gantz, T. 1971 "Divine triads on an Archaic Etruscan frieze plaque from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)", *StEtr* 39 (1-24).
- 1974 "The procession frieze from the Etruscan sanctuary at Poggio Civitate", *RM* 81 (1-14).
- 1975 "Terracotta figured friezes from the workshop of Vulca", *OpRom* 10 (1-9).
- Gardiner, M. 1992 *The Dialogics of the Critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Gianfrotta, P.A. 1972 *Castrum Novum. Forma Italiae, Regio VII*, 3. Rome: De Luca.

Giddens, A. 1979 *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. London: Macmillan Press.

Giglioli, G.Q. 1923 "Veio – Ritrovamenti sporadici" in *NotScav* (163-173).

1930 "Veio – Rinvenimento di alcune iscrizioni etrusche durante lo scavo del tempio scoperto in contrada Portonaccio, presso Isola Farnese", *NotScav* (302-345).

Gjerstad, E. 1960 *Early Rome III*. Stockholm: Afström.

'Gli Etruschi' 1972 *Gli Etruschi. Nuove ricerche e scoperte*, Ed: Istituto Svedese di Studi Classici di Roma e della Soprintendenza alle Antichità dell'Etruria Meridionale. Viterbo: Associazione Tuscia.

Glinister, F. 2000 "Sacred Rubbish" in *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy*, Eds: E. Bispham; C. Smith. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

2003 "Gifts of the gods: Sanctuary and society in Archaic Tyrrhenian Italy" in *Inhabiting Symbols: Symbol and Image in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Eds: J.B. Wilkins; E. Herring. London : Accordia Research Institute (137-147).

Gras, M. 2000 "Trade" in *The Etruscans*, Ed: M. Torelli. Venice: Bompiani (97-110).

Gualandi, G. 1970 "Il Santuario fontile a nord della città", *StEtr* 38 (217-223).

1974 "Santuari e stipi votive dell'Etruria padana", *StEtr* 42 (37-68).

Guidi, A. 1985 "An application of the rank-size rule to protohistoric settlements in the middle Tyrrhenian area" in *Papers in Italian Archaeology IV*, vol 3: *Patterns in Protohistory*, Eds: C. Malone and S. Stoddart. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports (217-240).

1990 "Alcune osservazioni sulla problematica delle offerte nella protostoria dell'Italia centrale", *Scienze dell'Antichità* 3-4 (403-414).

1993 *La necropoli veiente dei Quattro Fontanili nel quadro della fase recente della prima età del ferro italiana*. Firenze: Olschki.

Hague Sinos, R. 1994 "Godlike men: A discussion of the Murlo procession frieze" in *Murlo and the Etruscans*, Eds: R. De Puma and J.P. Small, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press (100-117).

Harre, R. 1979 *Social Being*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hencken, H. 1959 "Archaeological evidence for the origin of the Etruscans" in *CIBA Foundation Symposium on Medical Biology and Etruscan Origins*, Eds: G.E.W. Wolstenholme and C.M. O'Connor. London: Churchill (29-47).

1968 *Tarquinia and Etruscan Origins*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Hodder, I. 1982a *Symbols in Action. Ethnoarchaeological Studies of Material Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1982b "Theoretical Archaeology: a reactionary view" *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1-16).

1986 *Reading the Past, Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1987 *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2001 (Ed) *Archaeological Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Højte, J.M. 2002 *Images of Ancestors*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Inomata, T. 2001 "The power and ideology of artistic creation", *Current Anthropology* 42:3 (321-349).

Insol, T. 2004 *Archaeology, Ritual and Religion*. London: Routledge.

Izzet, V. 1998 "Holding a mirror to Etruscan gender" in *Gender and Italian Archaeology. Challenging the Stereotypes*, Ed: R.D. Whitehouse, London: Accordia Research Institute (209-227).

1999-2000 "Etruscan ritual and the recent excavations at Sant' Antonio, Cerveteri" in *ARP* 8 (133-148).

2000 "Tuscan Order: The development of Etruscan sanctuary architecture" in *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy*, Eds: E. Bispham and C. Smith. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

2001 "Form and meaning in Etruscan ritual space", *CAJ* 11:2 (185-200).

Jannot, J.-P. 1984 *Les reliefs archaïques de Chiusi*. Rome: École Française de Rome.

1988 "L'Étrurie intérieure de Lars Porsenna à Arruns le Jeune" in *MEFRA* 100 (601-614).

1993 "Insignia Potestatis" in *La civiltà di Chiusi e del suo territorio*. Eds: G. Maetzke and L. Tamagno Perna. Florence: Olschki (217-237).

Johnson, G.A. 1981 "Monitoring complex system integration and boundary phenomena with settlement size data" in *Archaeological Approaches to Study Complexity*. Ed: S.E. van der Leeuw. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam (144-181).

Johnson, A.W; T.K. Earle 1987 *The Evolution of Human Society: From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jurkeit, F. 1982 "Ein etruskisches Plektrum in Karlsruhe", in *Miscellanea Archaeologica Tobias Dohrn Dedicata*, Eds: H. Blanck, S. Steingräber. Rome: G. Bretschneider (53-62).

Kjellberg, L. 1940 *Larisa am Hermos: Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1902-1934*, II. *Die Architektonischen Terrakotten*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells.

Kolb, M.J. 1994 "Monumentality and the rise of religious authority in pre-contact Hawai'i", *Current Anthropology* 34:4 (521-537).

Kristiansen, K. 1991 "Chieftdoms, states, and systems of social evolution" in *Chieftdoms: Power, Economy, and Ideology*, Ed: T. Earle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (16-43).

Lambrechts, R. 1959 *Essai sur les magistratures des républiques étrusques*. Rome: Academia Belgica.

Lanciani, R. 1889 "Veio", *NotScav* (10-12).

Lazzeri, C. 1927 "Arezzo etrusca. Le origini della città e la stipe votiva alla Fonte Veneziana", *StEtr* 1 (113-127).

- Leonard, R.D. 2001 "Evolutionary Archaeology" in *Archaeological Theory Today*, Ed: I. Hodder. Cambridge: Polity Press (65-97).
- Leonard, R.D; G.T. Jones 1987 "Elements of an inclusive evolutionary model for archaeology" in *JAnthArch* 6 (199-219).
- Lugli, G. 1962 *Carta archeologica del territorio di Roma*. Firenze.
- Lulof, P.A. 1996 *The Ridge-pole Statues from the Late Archaic Temple at Satricum* Amsterdam: Thela.
- 2000 "Archaic terracotta acroteria representing Athena and Heracles: manifestations of power in central", *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 13 (206-219).
- Maetzke, G. 1993. "Tre canopi inediti da Sarteano" in G. Maetzke & L. Tamagno Perna (ed.), *La civiltà di Chiusi e del suo territorio. Proceeding of the XVII Convegno di studi etruschi e italici*. Eds: G. Maetzke and L. Tamagno Perna. Florence: Olschki (133-148).
- Maetzke, G; L. Tamagno Perna 1993 (Eds) *La civiltà di Chiusi e del suo territorio. Proceeding of the XVII Convegno di studi etruschi e italici*. Florence: Olschki.
- Maffei, A; F. Nastasi 1990 (Eds) *Caere e il suo Territorio da Agylla a Centumcellae*. Rome: Libreria dello Stato.
- Magi, F. 1932 "Stele e cippi Fiesolani", *StEtr* 6 (11-85).
- Maggiani, A. 2001 "L'area della città. La Vigna Parrochiale" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*, Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider (121-122).
- Malone, C; S. Stoddart 1985 (Eds) *Papers in Italian Archaeology IV*, vol 3: *Patterns in Protohistory*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Mangani, E. 1985 "Castelnuovo Berardenga" in *Case e palazzi d'Etruria*, Ed: S. Stopponi, Milan: Electa (155-163).
- 1990 "L'Orientalizzazione Recente nella Valle Dell'Ombrone", *Annali-Archeologia e Storia Antica* 12 (9-21).

- Mann, M. 1986 *The Sources of Power, Vol 1, A History of Power – From the Beginning to AD 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mannheim, K. 1971 “On the interpretation of *Weltanschauung*”, in *From Karl Mannheim*, Ed: K. Wolff. Oxford: Oxford University Press (136-186).
- Marcus, J. 1976 *Emblem and State in the Classical Maya Lowlands: An Epigraphic Approach to Territorial Organization*. Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University.
- 1983 “A synthesis of the cultural evolution of the Zapotec and Mixtec” in *Cloud People: Divergent Evolution of the Zapotec and Mixtec Civilizations*, Ed: K. V. Flannery and J. Marcus. New York: Academic Press (355-360).
- Matteucig, G. 1951 *Poggio Buco: The Necropolis of Stationia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mazzarino, S. 1945 *Dalla monarchia allo stato repubblicano. Ricerche di storia romana arcaica*. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.
- McGuire, R.H. 1992 *A Marxist Archaeology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mengarelli, R. 1927 “Montetosto”, *StEtr* 1 (170).
- Menichetti, M. 1988 “Le aristocrazie tirreniche: aspetti iconografici” in *Storia di Roma I: Roma in Italia*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi (75-124).
- 1994 *Archeologia del potere: re, immagini e miti a Roma e in Etruria in età arcaica*. Milan: Longanesi.
- 2000 “Political forms in the Archaic Period” in *The Etruscans*, Ed: M. Torelli. Venice: Bompiano.
- Merlino, M.; Mirenta, T. 1990 “Caere” in *Caere e il suo Territorio da Agylla a Centumcellae*. Eds: A. Maffei and F. Nastasi, Rome: Libreria dello Stato (4-92).
- Milani, L. 1912. *Il Real Museo Archeologico di Firenze II*. Florence: Arnaud.
- Moore, A.C. 1977 *Iconography of Religions: An Introduction*. London: SCM Press.

- Moore, C.B. 1974 (Ed) *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Studies*, Supplement 20.
- Moretti Sgubini, A.M. 2001 (Ed) *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider.
- Moretti Sgubini, A.M; L. Ricciardi 1993 "Le Terrecotte Architettoniche di Tuscania" in *Deliciae Fictiles*. Stockholm: Afström (163-181).
- Morris, I. 1987 *Burial and ancient society: The rise of Greek city-state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1992 *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2000 *Archaeology as Cultural History. Words and things in Iron Age Greece*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nardi, G. 1989 "Appunti sui santuari urbani" in *Miscellanea ceretana I, QuadAEI*, 17 (51-68).
- 2001 "Il santuario sulla Valle della Mola" in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*, Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider (157-158).
- Nielsen, E.O. 1987 "Some preliminary thoughts on new and old terracottas", *OpRom* 16 (91-119).
- Ogilvie, R.M. 1965 *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Östenberg, C.E. 1975 *Case etrusche di Acquarossa*. Rome: Monografie della Tuscia.
- 1976 "Acquarossa-Ferentium: Campagna di scavo 1975", *OpRom* 11 (39-52).
- 1983 "Acquarossa (Viterbo) – Rapporto preliminare. Cenni introduttivi, le necropoli e il periodi preistorici e protostorici", *NotScav* (25-104).
- Pace, B; R. Vighi; G.Ricci; M. Moretti 1955 *Caere – Scavi di Raniero Mengarelli* (*MonAnt* 42).
- Pairault Massa, F-H. 1992 *Iconologia e Politica nell' Italia Antica. Roma, Lazio*,

Etruria dal VII al I secolo A.C. Milan: Longanesi.

Pallottino, M. 1937 "Tarquinia", *MonAnt* 36:1 (99-122, 569-590).

1938-1939 "Scavo di un'area sacra a Veio", *Le Arti* 1 (402-403).

1939 "Iscrizioni", *StEtr* 13 (457).

1939-40 "Le recenti scoperte nel santuario 'dell'Apollo' a Veio", *Le Arti* II (17-21).

1956 *The Etruscans*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

1964 "Scavi nel santuario etrusco di Pyrgi", *ArchCl* 16 (49-117).

1989 "Tarquinia: Ricerche, scavi e prospettive" in *Acme. Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* 42 (5-10).

1991 *A History of Earliest Italy*. London: Routledge.

Panofsky, E. 1939 "Introductory" in *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1955 *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Pareti, L. 1955 *La Tomba Regolini-Galassi* (*MonAnt* 8).

Paribeni, E. 1938 "I rilievi chiusini arcaici", *StEtr* 12 (50-139).

Parker Pearson, M. 1982 "Mortuary Practices, society and ideology: an ethnoarchaeological study" in *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, Ed: I. Hodder. Cambridge: Cambridge University (99-113).

1984 "Social change, ideology and the archaeological record" in *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*, Ed: M. Spriggs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (59-71).

Pasqui, A. 1902 "Il Fèrento – Scavi nella necropoli", *NotScav* (84-94).

Patterson, H; F. di Gennaro; H. di Giuseppe; S. Fontana; V. Gaffney; A. Harrison; S.J. Keay; M. Millett; M. Rendeli; P. Roberts; S. Stoddart and R. Witcher 2000 "The Tiber Valley Project: the Tiber and Rome through two millennia", *Antiquity* 74 (395-403).

- Patterson, H; H. di Giuseppe; R. Witcher 2004 "Three South Etruscan 'crises': first results of the Tiber Valley Project", *PBSR* 72 (1-36).
- Pellegrini, E. 1989 *La necropoli di Poggio Buco: Nuovi dati per lo studio di un centro dell' Etruria interna nei periodi orientalizzante ed arcaico*. Florence: Olschki.
- Peroni, R. 1996 *L'Italia alle soglie della storia*. Roma: Laterza.
- Persson, C.B. 1986 "Acquarossa" in *Architettura etrusca nel Viterbese: ricerche svedesi a San Giovenale e Acquarossa 1956-1986*. Ed: C. Nylander. Rome: DeLuca (40-46).
- 1994 "The Field Architect's Urbanistic Notes" in *Acquarossa 7*. Stockholm: Afström (289-302).
- Pfiffig, A.J. 1969 *Die etruskische Sprache*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt
- 1975 *Religio Etrusca*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt
- Phillips, K.M. 1968 "Poggio Civitate", *Archaeology* 21 (252-261).
- 1972 "Bryn Mawr College excavations in Tuscany, 1971", *AJA* 76 (249-255).
- 1973 "Bryn Mawr College excavations in Tuscany, 1972", *AJA* 77 (319-326).
- 1993 *In the Hills of Tuscany*. Philadelphia: University Museum.
- Pigorini, L. 1903 "Le più antiche civiltà dell'Italia", *BPI* 29 (189-211).
- Pinza, G. 1907 "La Tomba Regolini Galassi e le altre rinvenute al'Sorbo", *RM* 22 (35-186).
- Poggio Civitate 1970 *Poggio Civitate (Murlo, Siena). The Archaic Sanctuary. Catalogue of the Exhibition*. Florence: Olschki.
- Pohl, I. 1972 *The Iron Age Necropolis of Sorbo at Cerveteri*. Stockholm: Afström.

Potter, T. 1979 *The Changing Landscape of South Etruria*. London: Paul Elek.

Prayon, F. 1981a "Historische Daten zur Geschichte von Caere und Pyrgi" in *Akten des Kolloquiums zum Thema: Die Göttin von Pyrgi: Archäologische, linguistische und religionsgeschichtliche Aspekte*, Ed: F. Prayon. Florence: Olschki (39-51).

1981b (Ed) *Akten des Kolloquiums zum Thema: Die Göttin von Pyrgi: Archäologische, linguistische und religionsgeschichtliche Aspekte*. Florence: Olschki

1993 "Orvieto – Tübinger Ausgrabungen in der Cannicella-Nekropole 1984-1990", *AA* (5-91).

Prayon, F; J.G. Gran-Aymerich 1999 "Castellina del Marangone (Comune di S. Marinella, Prov. Di Roma)", *RM* 106 (343-364).

'Principi Etruschi' 2000 *Principi Etruschi tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*. Bologna: Marsilio.

Preucel, R. W; I. Hodder 1996 (Eds) *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Quilici Gigli, S. 1976 *Blera. Topografia antica della città e del territorio* (DAI Sonderschriften 3).

Rathje, A. 1985 "Alcune considerazioni sulle lastre da Poggio Civitate con figure femminili" in *Le Donne in Etruria*. Ed: A. Rallo. Rome: G. Bretschneider (75-84).

1993 "Il fregio di Murlo: Considerazione sulle status" in *Deliciae Fictiles* (135-138).

1994 "Banquet and ideology: Some new considerations about banqueting at Poggio Civitate" in *Murlo and the Etruscans*, Eds: R. De Puma and J.P. Small, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press (95-99).

Rawson, E. 1978 "Caesar, Etruria and the Disciplina Etrusca", *JRS* (133-152).

Redman, C.L. 1978 *The Rise of Civilization: From Early Farmers to Urban Society in the Ancient Near East*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Rendeli, M. 1990 "Concorranza tra formazioni urbane dell'Italia centrale tirrenica nella costruzione di edifici di culto arcaico", *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archaeologia e Storia dell'Arte* 12 (1-20).

1993 *Citta Aperte*. Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale.

Renfrew, C. 1974 "Beyond subsistence economy. The evolution of social organization in Prehistoric Europe", *Reconstructing Complex Societies. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Studies*, Supplement 20, Ed: C.B. Moore (69-95).

1985 *The Archaeology of Cult. The Sanctuary at Phylakopi*. Oxford: British School at Athens; Thames and Hudson.

1986 "Introduction: peer polity interaction and socio-political change" in *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, Eds: C. Renfrew and J.F. Cherry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1-18).

Renfrew, C; J.F. Cherry 1986 (Eds) *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ricci, G. 1955 "Necropoli della Banditaccia – Zona A 'del Recinto'" in *Caere – Scavi di Raniero Mengarelli (MonAnt 42)* (201-1035).

Ricci Portoghesi, L. 1966 "Una nuova lastra dipinta cerite" in *ArchCl* 18 (16-22).

Ridgway, D. 1992 *The First Western Greeks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riva, C., S. Stoddart 1996 "Ritual landscapes in archaic Etruria" in *Approaches to the Study of Ritual*, Ed: J.B. Wilkins. London: Accordia Research Institute (91-110).

Rix, H. 1991 *Etruskische Texte*. Tübingen: G. Narr.

Rizzo, M.A. 1989 "Cerveteri – Il tumulo di Montetosto", in *Secondo congresso internazionale etrusco 1985. Atti I*, (Supplement of *StEtr*) (152-161).

1990 "Le anfore da trasporto e il commercio etrusco arcaico I. Complessi tombali dall'Etruria meridionale", *Studi di Archeologia* 3 (122-126).

1994 “Nuove lastre dipinte di Cerveteri”, in *Tyrrhenoi philotechnoi. Atti della giornata di studio*, Rome (51-60).

2001 “I doni votivi” in *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci. Città d'Etruria a confronto*, 2001. Ed: A.M. Moretti Sgubini. Rome: “L'Erma” di Bretschneider (150-153).

Romanelli, P. 1934 “Tarquinia – Saggi di scavo nell'area dell'antica città”, *NotScav* (438-443).

1948 “Tarquinia – scavi e ricerche nell'area della città”, *NotScav* (193-270).

Roos, P. 1994 “The tombs of San Cataldo”, in *Acquarossa VII. Trial Trenches, Tombs and Surface Finds*, Eds: L. Wendt, M.-B. Lundgren, P. Roos, E. Rystedt, M. Strandberg Oloffson, C.B. Persson. Stockholm: Afström (207-259).

Runciman, W.G. 1983 *A Treatise on Social Theory 1: The Methods of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, B. 1975 *Power: A New Social Analysis*. London: Unwin.

Rystedt, E. 1984 “Architectural terracotta as aristocratic display. The case of seventh-century Poggio Civitate (Murlo)”, *Opus* 3 (367-376).

1986 “Acquarossa” in *Architettura etrusca nel Viterbese: ricerche svedesi a San Giovenale e Acquarossa 1956-1986*. Ed: C. Nylander. Rome: DeLuca (30-33).

Sanders, W.T; J. Marino 1970 *New World Prehistory*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Santangelo, M. 1948 “Per la Storia di Veio fra la conquista romana ed il Municipum Augustum Vejens” in *Atti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Rendiconti* 8 (454-464).

Sassatelli, G. 2000 “Il Palazzo” in *Principi Etruschi tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*. Bologna: Marsilio (145-153).

Scalia, F. 1968 “I cilindretti del tipo chiusino con figure umane”, *StEtr* 36 (351-401).

- Schäfer, T. 1989 *Imperii Insignia. Sella curulis und fascies. Zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrate*, Mainz: von Zabern.
- Scheffer, C. 1972 "Swedish excavations in necropolis sud" in *Gli Etruschi. Nuove Ricerche e Scoperte*, Ed: Istituto Svedese di Studi Classici di Roma e della Soprintendenza alle Antichità dell'Etruria Meridionale. Viterbo: Associazione Tuscia.
- 1990 "Domus Regia: a Greek Tradition?", *OpAth* 17 (185-191).
- Sciacca, F. 2000 "Plettro" in *Principi Etruschi tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*. Bologna: Marsilio (287).
- Scullard, H.H. 1967 *The Etruscan Cities and Rome*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Seliger, M. 1977 *The Marxist Concept of Ideology. A critical essay*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Service, E.R. 1971 *Primitive Social Organisation, An Evolutionary Perspective* (2nd Edition). New York: Random House.
- 1975 *Origins of the State and Civilization: The Process of Cultural Evolution*. New York: Newton.
- Shanks, M; C. Tilley 1987 *Re-Constructing Archaeology, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shennan, S. 1986 "Interaction and change in third millennium BC western and central Europe" in *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, Eds: C. Renfrew, J.F. Cherry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (137-148).
- 1993 "After Social Evolution: a new archaeological agenda?" in *New Directions in Archaeology, Archaeological Theory: who sets the agenda?*, Eds: N. Yoffee and A. Sherratt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (53-59).
- 1996 "Cultural transmission and cultural change" in *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*, Eds: R.W. Preucel, I. Hodder. Oxford: Blackwell (282-296).
- Small, J.P. 1971 "The Banquet Frieze from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)", *StEtr* 39 (26-

61).

1987 "Left, right, and center": direction in Etruscan Art", *OpRom* 16 (125-135).

Smith, C. 1996 *Early Rome and Latium. Economy and Society c.1000-500 BC*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1970, *The Dark Age of Greece*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

1980 *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment*. London: Dent.

Sordi, M. 1960 *I rapporti romano-ceriti e l'origine della 'civitas sine suffragio'*. Rome: G. Bretschneider.

Spencer, C. 1987 "Rethinking the chiefdom" in *Chiefdoms in the Americas*, Eds: R. Drennan and C. Uribe. Boston: University Presses of America (369-389).

Spivey, N. 1991 "The power of women in Etruscan society", *ARP* 2 (55-68).

1997 *Etruscan Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Spivey, N.; S. Stoddart 1990 *Etruscan Italy*. London: Batsford.

Spores, R. 1983 "The origin and evolution of the Mixtec system of social stratification" in *Cloud People: Divergent Evolution of the Zapotec and Mixtec Civilizations*, Eds: K. V. Flannery and J. Marcus. New York: Academic Press (227-237).

Spriggs, M. 1984 (Ed) *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stefani, E. 1922 "Veio – Esplorazioni dentro l'area dell'antica città", *NotScav* (379-404).

1929 "Veio – Saggi e scoperte fortuite nella necropoli", *NotScav* (342-365).

1944 "Scavi archeologici a Veio in contrada Piazza d'Armi", *MontAnt* 40 (177-190).

1953 “Veio – tempio detto dell’Apollo. Esplorazione e sistemazione del santuario”, *NotScav* (29-112).

Stefani, E; G.Q. Giglioli 1930 “Veio. Rinvenimento di alcune iscrizioni etrusche durante lo scavo del tempio scoperto in contrada Portonaccio, presso Isola Farnese”, *NotScav* (302-345).

Steingräber, S. 1985 *Etruscan Painting*. New York: Iwanami Shoten.

2002 “Ahnenkult und bildliche Darstellungen von Ahnen in etruskischen und unteritalischen Grabgemälden aus vorrömischer Zeit” in *Images of Ancestors*, Ed: J.M. Højte. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press. (125-158).

Steuernagel, D. 1998 *Menschenopfer und Mord am Altar. Griechische Mythen in etruskischen Gräbern. DAI Rome 3*. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Stoddart, S. 1987 *Complex Polity Formation in Northern Etruria and Umbria, 1200-500 BC*, unpublished doctoral Thesis, University of Cambridge.

1990 “Political Landscapes of Etruria”, *ARP* 1 (39-51).

Stoddart, S; J. Whitley 1988 “The social context of literacy in Archaic Greece and Etruria”, *Antiquity* 62 (761-772).

Stopponi, S. 1985 (Ed.) *Casa e palazzi d’Etruria*. Milan: Electa.

Strandberg Olofsson, M. 1984 *Acquarossa V. The head antefixes and relief plaques. Part I. A reconstruction of a terracotta decoration and its architectural setting*. Stockholm: Afström

1993 “Variation in mould-made reliefs. The case of the large ‘Tuscania’ motifs in the light of some fragments from Acquarossa” in *Deliciae Fictiles* (193-200).

Strøm, I. 1971 *Problems Concerning the Origin and Early Development of the Etruscan Orientalizing style*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.

Talocchini, A. 1980 “Castelnuovo Berardenga (Siena)”, *StEtr* 48 (550-554).

Tassi Scandone, E. 2001 *Verghe, scuri e fasci littori in Etruria. Contributo allo studio degli Insignia Imperii*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider.

Threborn, G. 1980 *The Power of Ideology and the Ideology of Power*. London: Verso.

Thuillier, J.P. 1980 "A Propos des 'Triades Divines' de Poggio Civitate (Murlo)", *Hautes études du monde Gréco-Romain 10, Recherches sur les religions de l'antiquité classique* (383-394).

Torelli, M. 1967 "Terza campagna di scavi a Punta della Vipera (S. Marinella)", *StEtr* 35 (332-353).

1971 "Gravisca. Scavi nella città etrusca e romana. Campagne 1969 e 1970", *NotScav* (195-241).

1975 "Elogia", *Studi e Materiali* 15 (105-135).

1980 *Etruria, Rome and Bari. Guide archeologiche Laterza*, 3. Rome: Laterza.

1981 "Delitto religioso. Qualche indizio sulla situazione in Etruria" in *Les Délits religieux dans la cité antique (Table Ronde, Rome, 6-7 Avril 1978)*. Roma: École Française de Rome.

1982 "Veio. La città, l'arx e il culto di Giunone Regina" in *Miscellanea Archaeologica Tobias Dohrn Dedicata*, Eds: H. Blanck, S. Steingräber. Rome: G. Bretschneider (117-128).

1983 "Polis e 'Palazzo'. Architettura, ideologia e artigianato greco in Etruria tra VII e VI Sec. a.C." in *Collection de l'école française de Rome. Architecture et Société de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la république romaine*, vol 66 (471-499).

1988 "Le popolazioni dell'Italia antica: società e forme del potere" in *Storia di Roma I: Roma in Italia*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi (53-74).

1989 "Archaic Rome between Latium and Etruria" in *The Cambridge Ancient History VII. The Rise of Rome*. Eds: F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen, R.M. Ogilvie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (30-51).

1990 *Storia degli Etruschi*. Bari: Edipuglia.

1997 *Il Rango, il Rito, l'Immagine: Alle origini della rappresentazione storica romana*. Milan: Electa.

2000a (Ed.) *The Etruscans*. Venice: Bompiani.

2000b "Presentation" in *The Etruscans*, Ed: M. Torelli. Venice: Bompiani (17-23).

2000c "Etruscan Religion" in *The Etruscans*, Ed: M. Torelli. Venice: Bompiani (273-289).

2000d "Le Regiae etrusche e laziali tra Orientalizzante e Arcaismo" in *Principi Etruschi tra Mediterraneo ed Europa*. Venice: Marsilio Editori (67-78).

Torelli, M.; A. La Regina 1968 "Due Sortes", *ArchCl* 20 (221-229).

Torelli, M; I. Pohl 1973 "Veio – Scoperte di un piccolo santuario etrusco in località Campetti", *NotScav* (40-258).

Toti, O. 1967 "S. Marinella. Saggio di scavo eseguito nell'abitato protostorico de 'la Castellina'", *NotScav* (55-86).

Treherne, P. 1995 "The Warrior's Beauty: The masculine body and self-identity in Bronze-Age Europe", *Journal of European Archaeology* 31 (105-144).

Trigger, B. 1990 "Monumental architecture: a thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behaviour", *World Archaeology* 22 (119-132).

Trump, D.H. 1958 "The Appenine Culture of Italy", *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 24 (165-200).

van Buren, E.D. 1921 *Figurative Terracotta Revetments in Etruria and Latium in the VI and V Centuries BC*, London.

van der Leeuw, S.E. 1981 (Ed) *Archaeological Approaches to Study Complexity*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam

Vidén, A. 1978 "Acquarossa – Ferentium: Campagna di scavo 1978", *OpRom* 13 (63-68).

von Hase, F.W. 1969. *Die Tensen der Früheisenzeit in Italien (Prähistorische Bronzefunde* 16, 1).

- Walbank, F.W; A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen, R.M. Ogilvie 1989 (Eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History VII. The Rise of Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ward-Perkins, J.B 1959 "Excavations at Veii, 1957-58", *PBSR* 27, 38-79.
- 1961 *Veii: The Historical Topography of the Ancient City*, (*PBSR* 29).
- Wason, P.K. 1994 *The Archaeology of Rank*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitehouse, R. 1995 "From secret society to state religion: Ritual and social organisation in prehistoric and protohistoric Italy" in *Settlement and Economy in Italy, 1500 BC - AD 1500 : Papers of the Fifth Conference of Italian Archaeology*. Ed: Neil Christie. Oxford: Oxbow (83-88).
- Whitehouse, R.D. (ed.) *Gender and Italian Archaeology. Challenging the Stereotypes*, London: Accordia Research Institute.
- Wikander, C. 1981 *Acquarossa I. The Painted Architectural Terracottas. Part I. Catalogue and Architectural Context*. Stockholm: Afström
- 1988 *Acquarossa I. The Painted Architectural Terracottas. Part 2. Typological and Decorative Analysis*. Stockholm: Afström.
- Wikander, C; M. Strandberg Olofsson; A.M. Moretti Sgubini 1986 "Rivestimenti architettonici di tipo Acquarossa dalla necropoli di Ara del Tufo di Tuscania" in *Architettura etrusca nel Viterbese: ricerche svedesi a San Giovenale e Acquarossa 1956-1986*. Ed: C. Nylander. Rome: DeLuca (105-108).
- Wikander, Ö., C. Wikander 1984 *Acquarossa I*. Stockholm: Afström.
- 1990 "Early Monumental Complex at Acquarossa". *OpRom* 18:2 (189-206).
- Wilkins, J.B. 1996a "Urban language ritual" *Approaches to the Study of Ritual. Italy and the Ancient Mediterranean*. Eds: J.B. Wilkins. London: Accordia Research Centre (1-7).
- Wilkins, J.B 1996b (Ed) *Approaches to the Study of Ritual*. London: Accordia

- Wilkins, J.B; E. Herring 2003 (Eds) *Inhabiting Symbols: Symbol and Image in the Ancient Mediterranean*. London: Accordia Research Institute.
- Wilson, P.J. 1988 *The Domestication of the Human Species*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. 2001 "Reading Carandini", *JRS* 91 (182-193).
- Wissowa, G. 1912 *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Munich: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Wolff, K.H. 1971 *From Karl Mannheim*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wrong, D. 1979 *Power. Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Yoffee, N. 1993 "Too many chiefs? (or, Safe texts for the '90s)" in *New Directions in Archaeology, Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (60-78).
- Yoffee, N; A. Sherratt 1993 (Eds) *New Directions in Archaeology, Archaeological Theory: who sets the agenda?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zanker, P. 1988 *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, (translated by A. Shapiro). Ann Arbor : Michigan University Press.
- Zifferero, A. 1995 "Economia, divinità e frontiera: sul ruolo di alcuni santuari di confine in Etruria meridionale", *Ostraka* 4 (335-350).

The Construction of Power.

An Investigation into the Nature and Representation of Authority in
Etruria During the Orientalising and Archaic Periods
(seventh and sixth centuries BC).

Volume II
Figures and Charts

C. Roth-Murray

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D
Institute of Archaeology
University College London
2005

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter I

- I.1 Thiessen Polygons of settlement hierarchies of southern Etruria, during a) the Final Bronze Age and b) the Early Iron Age (from Di Gennaro 1982).
- I.2 Rank-size rule technique for three time periods of Southern Etruria (from Guidi 1985).
- I.3 X-tent plot for eighth century BC Etruria (from Stoddart 1987).

Chapter II

- II.1 Urn from Chiusi with lictor scene, date unstated (Tassi Scandone 2001).
- II.2 Frieze plaque from Palestrina, with a figure holding a *lituus* (Andrén 1940).
- II.3 The Vitruvian Model of the Tuscan Temple.
- II.4 The Veii-Rome-Velletri Frieze Plaque Series (from Bruun 1993).
- II.5 ‘Seated Assembly’ Frieze Plaques from a) Velletri (from Andrén 1940) and b) Murlo (Poggio Civitate 1970).
- II.6 Inscription of ‘*calaturus mi*’ from Caere (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- II.7 Sarcophagus of the Magistrate from Tarquinia (from Tarquinia Museo Archeologico Nazionale).
- II.8 Zagreb mummy wrappings (from Bonfante and Bonfante 2002).
- II.9 François Tomb at Vulci (from *Die Etrusker* 2004).
- II.10 Pyrgi plaques (from Bonfante and Bonfante 2002).
- II.11 Cortona tablet (from Bonfante and Bonfante 2002).
- II.12 *Bucchero* cup with ‘*rex*’ inscription from the Regia at Rome (from Cristofani 1990).

Chapter IV

- IV.1 Map of Etruria.
- IV.2 The site of Aquarossa (from Östenberg 1986).
- IV.3 Aquarossa Zone B (from Östenberg 1986).
- IV.4 Aquarossa Zones C and F (from Östenberg 1986).
- IV.5 Aquarossa Zone F (from Wikander O., C. Wikander 1990).
- IV.6 “white on red” style terracotta decoration (from C. Wikander 1988).
- IV.7 Acquarossa frieze plaques (from Strandberg Olofsson 1984).
- IV.8 Antefix of female head (from Stranberg Olofsson 1984).
- IV.9 Castelnuovo Berardenga tombs A, B (from Mangani 1985).
- IV.10 Castelnuovo Berardenga Monumental Complex (from Talocchini 1980).
- IV.11 Murlo Monumental Complex (from Phillip 1993).
- IV.12 Antefix of female head (from *Poggio Civitate* 1970).
- IV.13 Sphinx Monumental Complex (from *Poggio Civitate* 1970).
- IV.14 Murlo ‘Cowboy’ (from Spivey 1997).
- IV.15 Frieze Plaques (from Rathje 1993).
- IV.16 The site of Caere (from Boitani; Cataldi and Pasquinucci 1975).
- IV.17 Plan of the Banditaccia necropolis (from Barker and Rasmussen 1998: 233, after Prayon 1975).
- IV.18 The plateau of Caere with a) the distribution of Villanovan pottery, and b) the

potential coverage of settlement areas during the Archaic period, major areas listed by name (from Maffei and Nastasi 1990).

- IV.19 Regolini Galassi Tomb (from Canina 1838).
- IV.20 Vigna Parrocchiale with the 'monumental complex' on the left and the fifth century BC circular structure on the right (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.21 Architectural terracotta of bearded man (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.22 Female head antefix, type V (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.23 Painted frieze plaque of centaurs (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.24 Painted frieze plaque of dogs (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.25 Figured frieze plaque fragments of horse scene (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.26 Subterranean feature at Vigna Parrocchiale a) from above, b) side view (from Cristofani 1992).
- IV.27 Sant' Antonio a) phase I and b) phase II (from Izzet 1999-2000).
- IV.28 Sant' Antonio phase III (from Izzet 1999-2000).
- IV.29 Bronze club votive (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.30 Bronze weight votive (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.31 Valle della Mola (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.32 Montetosto area (from Stopponi 1985).
- IV.33 Montetosto structure (from Stopponi 1985).
- IV.34 Map of the Pyrgi area (from Boitani, Cataldi, Pasquinucci 1975).
- IV.35 Sanctuary of Pyrgi (from Spivey and Stoddart 1990).
- IV.36 The site of Tarquinia (from Boitani, Cataldi, Pasquinucci 1975).
- IV.37 View of the Civita Complex excavation area (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
- IV.38 Plan of the sectors of the Civita Complex (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
- IV.39 Plan of area alpha and edificio beta (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
- IV.40 Plan of Ara della Regina (from Romanelli 1948).
- IV.41 Reconstruction of Ara della Regina (from Romanelli 1948).
- IV.42 Fragments VRV frieze plaques (from Cataldi 1993).
- IV.43 Sima of battle scene (from Cataldi 1993).
- IV.44 Plan of the Central Structure (from Romanelli 1948).
- IV.45 Fragments VRV frieze plaques a) banqueting scene, b) left procession (from Cataldi 1993; Romanelli 1948).
- IV.46 Fragment of frieze plaque scene of soldiers walking to the right (from Cataldi 1993).
- IV.47 Partial plan of the Santuario structure (from Romanelli 1948).
- IV.48 Gravisca (from Torelli 1971).
- IV.49 The *lituus*, axe and shield from edificio beta in the Civita Complex (from Bonghi Jovino and Chiaramonte Treré 1997).
- IV.50 Frieze plaque scene of steers from the Central Structure (from Cataldi 1993).
- IV.51 Fragment of statue from Ara della Regina, late sixth century (from Romanelli 1948).
- IV.52 Map of Veii (from Ward-Perkins 1961).
- IV.53 Pottery density chart for Veii (from Patterson et al. 2000).
- IV.54 Map of Veii with its surrounding cemeteries (from Ward-Perkins 1961).
- IV.55 Tomb 5, Monte Michele (from Bartoloni 1983).
- IV.56 Tomba Campana, Monte Michele (from Steingraber 1985).

- IV.57 Iron Age oval hut (from Stefani 1953).
- IV.58 Macchia Grande structure (from Stefani 1922).
- IV.59 North West gate structure (from Ward-Perkins 1959).
- IV.60 Piazza d'Armi, Early Iron Age Phase (from Stefani 1944).
- IV.61 Piazza d'Armi, second phase (from Stefani 1944).
- IV.62 Frieze plaque fragment of procession going right (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.63 Frieze plaque fragment of panther (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.64 Frieze plaque fragment of felines (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.65 Plan of Campetti structure (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.66 Archaic antefixes from Campetti (from Pallottino 1938/1939).
- IV.67 Frieze plaque fragment of procession to the left (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.68 Frieze plaque fragment of VRV horseriding scene (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.69 Frieze plaque fragment of VRV of left procession (from Giglio 1923).
- IV.70 Frieze plaque fragment of VRV of chariot racing (from Giglio 1923).
- IV.71 Comunità Temple (from Moretti Sgubini 2001).
- IV.72 Head of female statue (from Moretti Sgubini 2001)
- IV.73 Antefixes of female heads (from Moretti Sgubini 2001)
- IV.74 Frieze plaque fragment of horse scene, very similar to the VRV right procession (from Giglio 1923).
- IV.75 Plan of the Portonaccio Temple (from Colonna 2001).
- IV.76 Frieze plaque fragments, Stefani and Gantz identified as from the VRV series (altered from Stefani 1953).
- IV.77 Antefix of female head (from Colonna 1987).
- IV.78 Ridgepole statues of Hermes, Apollo and Latona (from Spivey 1997).
- IV.79 Portonaccio side view of final phase (from Stefani 1953).
- IV.80 Map of the Castellina del Marangone area (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.81 Plan of Castellina del Marangone site (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.82 Detail of plan with building III (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.83 Fragments of female statue (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.84 Fragments of frieze plaque from the Acquarossa-Tuscania series left procession scene (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.85 Fragments of frieze plaque of scene with steers (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.86 Ivory figurine of female head (from Prayon and Gran-Aymerich 1999).
- IV.87 Plan of Punta della Vipera temple structure (area B) and the altar (area C) (from Torelli 1967).
- IV.88 Lead *sors* (from Torelli and La Regina 1968).
- IV.89 Map of the Poggio Buco area (from Bartoloni 1992: fig 7).
- IV.90 Fragments of frieze plaques of procession to the right (from Bartoloni 1992).
- IV.91 Sphinx and stag scene (from Bartoloni 1992).
- IV.92 Fragmented frieze plaque scenes of horseriding to the left (from Bartoloni 1992).
- IV.93 Ara del Tufo at Tuscania (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.94 Fragmented scenes from the Acquarossa-Tuscania frieze plaque series (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.95 Fragmented left procession scene of the Acquarossa-Tuscania frieze plaque series, variant I (from Strandberg Olofsson 1993).
- IV.96 Fragmented right procession scene of the Acquarossa-Tuscania frieze plaque

- series, variant II (from Strandberg Olofsson 1993).
- IV.97 Fragmented sima with cavalry striding procession scene (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.98 Fragmented sima with cavalry galloping procession scene (from Sgubini Moretti and Ricciardi 1993).
- IV.99 Plan of the Cannicella sanctuary (from Andrén 1967).
- IV.100 Antefix of female head from Cannicella (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.101 Marble statue of nude female from Cannicella (from Andrén 1967).
- IV.102 Antefix of Silen head or Achelous from Chiusi (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.103 Antefix of female head from Chiusi (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.104 Antefixes of Silens or Achelous from Vulci (from Andrén 1940).
- IV.105 Votives from the Fonte Veneziana at Arezzo (from Lazzeri 1927).
- IV.106 Spring sanctuary at Marzabotto (from Gualandi 1970).
- IV.107 Bronze votives from the spring sanctuary (from Gualandi 1974).
- IV.108 Regia at Rome, Phases three and four (from Brown 1974-1975).
- IV.109 Regia at Rome, Phase five (Scheffer 1990: 186).
- IV.110 Fragments of frieze plaque scene with minotaur between felines (from Downey 1993).
- IV.111 Plan of the Temple at Velletri (in grey) (from Fortunati 1990).
- IV.112 Reconstruction of the Temple at Velletri (from Fortunati 1990).

Chapter VI

- VI.1.1 Sketch of both statues and photograph of the right statue, from Tomb of the Seated Statues, Ceri, 690-670 BC (from Colonna and von Hase 1984).
- VI.1.2 Ivory *lituus* from Tomb A, Casale Marittimo, early seventh century (Roth-Murray 2001).
- VI.1.3 Trumpet *lituus* from Fossa Votiva 284, Tarquinia, first quarter seventh century (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.4 *Lituus* from Banditaccia, Caere, first quarter of the sixth century (from Spivey 1997).
- VI.1.5 Assembly Scene frieze plaques, Murlo, first quarter of the sixth century BC (from Rathje 1993).
- VI.1.6 *Stele*, “*Avile Tite*”, Volterra, mid sixth century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.7 Bronze augur figure, Lapis Niger, Rome, 550 BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.8 Urn, context unknown, 550 BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.9 Detail of figure with *lituus* from Ara del Tufo, Tuscania, mid-late sixth century (from Strandberg Olofsson 1993).
- VI.1.10 Assembly Scene urn, Chiusi, third quarter of the sixth century BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.11 Assembly Scene urn, late sixth century BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.12 Urn, context unknown, late sixth century BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.1.13 Tomba degli Auguri (from Steingraber 1985).
- VI.1.14 Painting, Tomba Giocolieri, Tarquinia, 510 BC (from Steingraber 1985).
- VI.1.15 Cippus, augur figure, Fiesole, 6/5th century (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.1.16 Possible altar with sacrifice scene, unknown context, beginning of fifth century (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.2.1 Bronze Axes, Tomb of the Warrior, Tarquinia, second half of the eighth century BC (Hencken 1968).

- VI.2.2 Miniature Axe, Bologna, mid-eighth to early seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.3 Axe, Chiusi, ziro tomb- via Cassia, late eighth to early seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.4 Knives from Statonia, the necropolis of Poggio Buco (from Matteucig 1951).
- VI.2.5 Axe, Tarquinia, Fossa 284, *edificio beta*, first quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.6 Axe, Casale Marittimo, Tomb A, first quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.7 Axe, Casale Marittimo, Tomb H1, second quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.8 Axe, Casale Marittimo, Tomb H2, second quarter of the seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.9 Axe, Trestina, seventh century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.2.10 *Bucchero* axe, Tarquinia, Tomb on Poggio Gallinaro, mid-seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.11 *Fasces*, Vetulonia, Tomba del Littore, 630-625 BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2001).
- VI.2.12 Miniature clay hatchet Sarteano, 630-601 BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.2.13 Vetulonia, Funeral *stele* end of seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.14 Bronze knife, context unknown, seventh to sixth century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.2.15 Image of Axe, Veii, Tomba Campana, 600 BC (from Steingräber 1985).
- VI.2.16 Images of two knives and one double axe in the frieze plaques from Murlo, Poggio Civitate c 600 BC (from Rathje 1993).
- VI.2.17 Sandstone *stele*, “*Larthie Ninie*”, Fiesole, first half of the sixth century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.2.18 Image of knife, Tarquinia, Tomba dei Tori, mid-sixth century BC (from Steingräber 1985).
- VI.2.19 Image of knives, Chiusi, Urn with sacrifice scene, 550 BC (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.2.20 Judgment of Paris (from Steuernagel 1998).
- VI.3.1 Detail of the VRV left procession, the Acquarossa-Tuscania right procession and the Murlo procession (altered from Bruun 1993; Wikander, C; Wikander, O. 1988; Rathje 1993).
- VI.3.2 Distribution of Chariots in tombs according to gender (from Emiliozzi 1999).
- VI.3.3 ‘Boccanera’ painted plaques, mid-sixth century, from Banditaccia, Caere (from Spivey 1997).
- VI.3.4 Fruit or flower-shaped *plectrum*, second half of the seventh century BC (from Torelli 2000).
- VI.3.5 Sceptre with a flower-shaped finial, Tomba Barberini, Palestrina, seventh century BC (from *Principi Etruschi* 2000).
- VI.3.6 Detail of the VRV ‘seated assembly’ scene frieze plaque (altered from Bruun 1993).
- VI.3.7 Urn depicting two male figures, late sixth century (from Jannot 1984).
- VI.3.8 Detail of wall painting from the Tomba Giocolieri at Tarquinia, dated to 510 BC (from Steingräber 1985).

LIST OF CHARTS

Chapter V

Chart V.1 Chronology of the Ritual Structures

Chart V.2 Frieze Plaque Themes Represented in Total















